DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 610 HE 000 933

Proceedings. 16th SREB Legislative Work Conference August 27/29 1967. The Organization of Higher Education.

Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.

Pub Date 67

Note-84p.; Papers presented at the 16th Annual Legislative Work Conference, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, August 27-29, 1967

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.30

Descriptors-Community Colleges, •Coordination, •Educational Coordination, Federal Aid, •Institutional Role, Planning, Private Colleges, •State Agencies, State Aid, •State Programs, State Universities

Identifiers-•Statewide Coordination

The 16th Annual Legislative Work Conference, attended by senators and delegates from 13 states and representatives of universities, higher education associations, and state boards of education, addressed itself to such basic questions as: What kinds of institutions make up a comprehensive state system of higher education? What are the specific roles to be played by each type of institution? How can the development of a system best be coordinated? What should be the relationship between private institutions and a state system? What effect does the federal government's assistance to higher education have on a state system? Papers exploring the ramifications of these questions were presented by John D. Millet, Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, Dana B. Hamel, Director of the Virginia Department of Community Colleges, Glenn S. Dumke, Chancellor of the California State Colleges, John W. Oswald, President of the University of Kentucky, Robert O. Berdahl, Director of a study of statewide systems of higher education at the American Council on Education, and Allan M. Cartter, Chancellor of New York University. The Proceedings include excerpts from comments made at a panel discussion on The Impact of Federal Activity on State Organization of Higher Education. (JS)

ED029610

proceedings

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

16th SREB
Legislative
Work
Conference
August 27/29 1967

The Organization of Higher Education

HE000933

higher
education

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

FOREWORD

Higher education continues to grow more complex. Increasing numbers of students have dictated the founding of new institutions and the expansion of older ones. New sources of money and increased state appropriations have changed the character of many institutions. The establishment of statewide agencies responsible for higher education has added still another dimension to this perplexing enterprise.

Legislators charged with responsibility for decisions that ultimately determine the character of a state system of higher education regularly face a number of questions for which there are no clear-cut answers. Some of these basic questions include the following: What kinds of institutions make up a comprehensive state system of higher education? What are the specific roles to be played by each type of institution? How can the development of a system best be coordinated? What should be the relationship between private institutions and a state system? What effect does the federal government's assistance to higher education have on a state system?

To explore some of the ramifications of these questions, the Legislative Advisory Council of the Southern Regional Education Board chose "The Organization of Higher Education" as the topic for the Sixteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference. The conference was held in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, August 27-29, 1967, and was attended by legislators from all parts of the region. The papers prepared for this conference and the speeches delivered were of such high quality that they have been reproduced in this publication for wide distribution.

The Annual Legislative Work Conference is planned by the SREB Legislative Advisory Council, which is composed of senators and representatives from each state in the region. This consideration of the organization of higher education followed recent work conferences on quality in higher education and the financing of higher education.

Winfred L. Godwin, Director
Southern Regional Education Board

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword. iii

Opening Address
    Governor Hulett C. Smith 1

State-wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education
    John D. Millett. 5

Background Papers

The Community College: Its Foundation and Structure
    Dana B. Hamel 21

The Role and Status of State Colleges in Public Higher Education
    Glenn S. Dumke. 29

The Mission of the Complex University in Public Higher Education
    John W. Oswald. 39

The State Planning and Coordinating Agency for Higher Education
    Robert O. Berdahl 51

The Responsibility of States for Private Colleges and Universities
    Allan M. Cartter 67

Panel Discussion

The Impact of Federal Activity on State Organization of Higher Education

Lanier Cox. 75
Congressman John Brademas 77
James A. Turman 78
Governor Robert E. McNair 78
Representative Mac Barber 79

Roster of Delegates and Participants. 81

OPENING ADDRESS

by

Governor Hulett C. Smith, West Virginia

Many times since I've been Governor, I've said "Welcome to West Virginia, but seldom to such a distinguished group of friends who are so interested in the progress of education. We're delighted to have you with us in West Virginia for this meeting, at the unequaled of the great resorts of the world--the Greenbrier.

West Virginians are proud of this facility, and hope you have the time to enjoy yourselves while you're here, even though faced with a very busy schedule. Please find some time to see a little of the natural beauty of West Virginia while you are here.

This work conference ranks among the finest endeavors of the Southern Regional Education Board. And as we all know, SREB has a long record of fine endeavor.

During this past year as chairman of the Board, I've been in closer contact with SREB's staff members and have become more familiar with their activities. I want you to know, I'm increasingly impressed, not only by the scope of these activities, but above all by their pertinence and their meaning for not only the people in the southern region but for our nation.

It is not often that we find two major segments of society--educators and politicians--so determined to join in a successful pursuit of a single goal. But through the SREB, this is precisely what is being done; working together for the sole purpose of expanding and improving higher education in our region.

We're trying to meet demands that have no parallel in all of history. We're seeking to improve the quality of the higher learning experience, so future generations can be assured of having access to the mental skills they will need for life and work in a world we cannot even visualize today.

In addition to those of you who are here from our region, we also have with us several guests from other parts of the nation, and I want to welcome them to West Virginia. I believe our guests will find these sessions informative and stimulating. And for their benefit, and perhaps for our own benefit, I would like to review some of the recent developments in higher education in the south--very briefly, and in very broad terms.

Governor Smith was Chairman of the Southern Regional Education Board 1966-67.

In the first five years of the 1960's, the number of students attending colleges and universities in the region of the SREB increased by 57 per cent. College enrollments grew from 29 per cent to 35 per cent.

In 1965, for the first time, one of every two southern high school graduates entered college. And last fall, 36 per cent of the region's college-age population was attending college. This has been a dramatic growth. And the states participating in SREB have made a magnificent effort to match this growth.

Throughout the region, graduate education is expanding rapidly. In five years, doctoral programs increased by 40 per cent, and the region's share of doctorates awarded grew from 14 to 17 per cent of the national total.

New community junior colleges have been opening so frequently that sometimes it has been difficult to keep count. In one year alone, the SREB states authorized the creation of 32 new junior colleges. From 1960 to 1964, enrollments in the junior colleges of the region actually doubled.

New senior colleges and universities are also being established at an impressive rate and the existing institutions are building new facilities at a rapid clip. I could cite a wealth of statistics, but you know this story, because it is evident in every state represented here tonight. The point I'm making is that we are involved in this "growth and improvement" process, and the end is not in sight.

Higher education is becoming so much a part of the modern American scene that it will continue to grow faster than the population, and it will become more diversified as knowledge and technology advance.

This brings me back to the SREB. In the 19 years since the Board was created, by interstate compact, its impact on the region cannot really be calculated. At first, SREB members concentrated on the development of exchange programs, to give students low-cost access to courses not available in their home states. These programs are still flourishing today, but in addition to this, SREB has trained its sights on a whole range of different activities. It is responding today to all of the major challenges facing higher education in our region.

We have projects underway in nursing education, in higher educational opportunity, the computer sciences, the agricultural sciences, mental health training and research, continuing education for journalists, resource development, and various other fields. All of these efforts are intended to help our region meet our needs in higher education.

The services SREB is making available to our colleges and universities are growing each day. These services are of great value to the region, because they provide information and consultation. A ready example of their worth is that they have stimulated much of the effort in recent years of our member states to engage in comprehensive, statewide, long-range planning for systems of higher education.

This organization was created to encourage the improvement of higher education, and to foster cooperation toward that goal. This is what SREB is doing today. It is serving all of its member states well. For example, there can be no doubt that the Board has played a significant role in the development of community junior colleges in several states.

The Board has offered valuable guidance on financing higher education, expanding graduate programs, and keeping state officials and educators informed on the quality, quantity and needs for education. Educational goals that will improve this region economically and socially have been set by the Board.

I think our outstanding record of regional cooperation springs from two facts: we have stuck to our original purposes, and the Board maintains an essential balance between the needs of education and the realities of political support. The scope of our activities may have changed, and the focus may shift from time to time. But we continue to aim at clearing away the obstacles that stand between this region and expanded, improved higher education. And thankfully we're usually on target.

Not everything that should be done in higher education can be done "right away." We know there is no magic wand that can be waved to solve all of our problems. But, I believe SREB performs a most useful service in pointing toward the ideal . . . in pointing out the shortcomings . . . and at the same time, we're not the least bit interested in pointing an accusing finger at anyone.

The Board, of course, is composed of governors, legislators and educators; that is why this essential balance has been maintained through the years. This dialogue between educators and government leaders is essential. This has to be a two-way street. I think such an exchange of views tends to make educators realistic in their demands on government and government leaders mindful of their heavy responsibilities in the field of education.

So this is what we seek here, a continuation of a healthy dialogue, to help us join together in meeting some of the problems of this region. This is why we in West Virginia are so happy to have so many leaders, in government and in education, at this legislative work conference. This is the SREB formula at work, because you'll all have a chance to examine in great detail many major aspects of higher education. And this is important, because you legislators are the ones who will be appropriating funds, and coming out with the planning and coordinating agencies for higher education. Anyone who doubts the significance of having informed legislators should try being a governor for one or two sessions of the legislature.

While I'm talking about legislators, I want to point out that several legislators in the region accomplished many noble things for higher education this year. New institutions were created in several states. There were substantial increases in financial support for many public institutions. Master planning for the long-range development of higher educational systems was a frequent topic of exploration, and debate, and action.

Two states created coordinating boards for their public colleges and universities, and this means that, with a few exceptions, the states of the region now have workable instruments for planning. Planning is the greatest single need in higher education today, not only in this region, but nationwide. This is the key to providing institutions that stimulate improvement for the individual, and improvement for society. We need properly planned systems of higher education that provide for students whose interests and abilities cover a braod spectrum, whose goals are diverse, whose economic means vary tremendously.

In short, education must be available to all citizens to the extent that they may profit from it. To do this the state system must include institutions of different types, from the two-year college with terminal and transfer programs to the graduate or professional school. Student costs must be kept minimal, and scholarship and loan programs should be as numerous and generous as possible.

Both the student and society should be of prime concern to both the institution and the state, and it is essential that the system of higher education be planned to avoid duplication of costly programs, as well as to insure the optimum use of the state's human and financial resources. This planning has to involve the professional educators as well as the elected representatives of the people. You can't have one without the other. Higher education is increasingly becoming a public business, and its quality and quantity are firmly tied to the public purse-strings.

We "politicians" are the ones who feel the public pulse, and I think we are all acutely aware of the need for solutions to public problems in our complex society--the problems of economic growth, urban blight, human rights, air and water pollution, conservation, better health and housing and communication. All of these things bring into sharper focus the significance of our institutions of higher learning, because many of us look to them to provide many of the answers to todays problems in developing these solutions to be presented to our legislative bodies. The quality of research and teaching is a key factor.

So we're really talking about calculated action to be taken by informed leaders. We cannot plan for eventualities we do not understand. We can't strive for meaningless goals. And this is why we're here--to know the demands and the challenges that face higher education in our part of the United States. We have a real mental exercise awaiting us, particularly when we delve into how to organize public higher education to get the best results. This is what this conference is all about, and it should be of benefit to all of us, and to the people we serve.

Our best academic and political talents must merge as one, if we're to enrich life in the region. This is the type of fusion we're now practicing. This is the type we want to perfect here at White Sulphur Springs. We are at your service, and we want to do anything we can to make this the most meaningful Legislative Workshop SREB has ever had. We hope you enjoy your stay with us.

STATE-WIDE PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by
John D. Millett

Perhaps few subjects have attracted more attention in recent years in the whole area of higher education than that of state-wide coordination. A recent study reported that 34 states now had state-wide boards of higher education. There are another 4 states with only one state university, although in two of these instances there are branch campuses. This would mean that only 12 states today are without some statutory or constitutional form of state-wide planning and coordination of higher education. Actually, my own personal enumeration indicates that there are at present in the United States 11 states which have a state-wide single governing board for two or more separate state institutions of higher education. Of these 11 states, three are located in the south. Incidentally, the most recent date for such state action seems to be 1931, when the Board of Regents for the University System of Georgia was offically created. I also count 22 states which now have established state-wide coordinating boards for higher education, of which 5 are in southern states. With two exceptions, such action has been taken in various states in the past 16 years, between 1951 in New Mexico and 1967 in New Jersey. It has been this recent action in some 20 states and consideration of such action in another half dozen states which has attracted so much current attention.

In these remarks this evening, I shall focus my attention upon state-wide planning and coordination of higher education. Such planning and coordination may be undertaken by either a state-wide governing board or a state-wide coordinating board. I do not desire to be drawn into any discussion about the relative merits of state-wide governing boards as against state-wide coordinating boards. Obviously, a governing board has much more legal authority than a coordinating board. In actual practice, however, it is my observation that state-wide governing boards and coordinating boards confront much the same kind of problems.

These problems begin with institutional identity and institutional ambitions. I wish time would permit me to trace in some detail the history of higher education state by state in the United States. This history is rich in experience, varied in its content, and revealing of the social changes of America. I can do no more than outline a few salient features of this story, none of which will be necessarily accurate for any one state. The common theme of this history is that for various reasons most state governments have found it desirable to establish two or more institutions of higher education within their borders.

Dr. Millett is Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents.

In colonial America the early colleges, of which there were nine by 1776, were established by royal charter or by charter of a colonial legislature. The governing boards were usually self-perpetuating, even though some form of colonial assistance in the form of land grants or even direct money grants was often provided. Eventually, only two of these, the College of William and Mary and Rutgers, were destined to become state government-sponsored institutions of higher education. Only one state constitution of the original 13 new states provided for a state university. The University of North Carolina was authorized in 1776, chartered in 1789, and began collegiate instruction in 1795. The other early state governments were somewhat slow in organizing state universities.

Yet the Congress of the United States under the Articles of Confederation in enacting its noteworthy Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stipulated that new states admitted to the Union would be expected to support state universities through grants of public land. The state university movement in America owes its real impetus to this great piece of early legislation, adopted two years before the Federal Constitution went into effect in 1789.

A second factor influencing state government interest in higher education arose as a result of the movement for universal, free elementary education in public schools, a movement which began in Massachusetts in the 1830's and with which the name of Horace Mann is indelibly linked. In order to staff these elementary schools, various state boards of education or state legislatures found it necessary to establish normal schools. In some states the school districts used only high school graduates as teachers, and elsewhere the private colleges or existing state universities long provided teachers. Eventually, all but a half dozen states established normal schools. After 1900 most of these became state teachers colleges. After World War II these state tachers colleges began to evolve into state colleges or state universities.

A third influence in the development of state government concern with higher education was the famous Morrill Land-Grant College Act of 1862. The Congress of the United States provided land grants or land-grant script to each state government setting up a state institution for instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts, among other subjects of study. In some states this federal land grant was passed along by legislative action to the existing state university. In 21 states the state legislatures saw fit to create new colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, often referred to in early days as "cow colleges." In many New England and Middle Atlantic states the first state university was not established until after the 1862 Morrill Act. In time, most of these colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts became academic, athletic, and budget rivals of the existing state universities.

A fourth major development must be noted, occurring since 1900 for the most part. All of us are aware that in this century we have moved in America from a predominantly agricultural to a predominantly industrial nation, from a predominantly rural population to a predominantly urban population. Many colleges and universities in our country were located in small towns; often these towns remained relatively small and were passed by in the growth of major centers of urban life. The problem then became how these urban centers were to be provided with higher education service. In some places private institutions were created; some of these have now been converted into state universities. We have had two such instances in Ohio. In some places municipal universities were established; most of these have now become state universities. In some states junior or community colleges grew up. In some states branch campuses of state universities were set up. We are still struggling in this country to meet the higher education needs of urban America.

The result of all these circumstances is that most states in the United States have a considerable number of publicly sponsored, publicly supported institutions of higher education. I have seen a figure of over 100 public institutions of higher education in California, and I'm not sure all the various campuses were included. A corresponding figure of over 60 public institutions of higher education has been given for New York. I hve counted 16 states with more than 20 public institutions of higher education; 14 states with from 10 to 20 public institutions; and 6 with from 5 to 10 institutions. And it's doubtful if these counts actually include all the higher education campuses in many of the states.

These circumstances gave some cause for concern to state government officials during the depression years of the 1930's. It has been only since the end of World War II, however, when higher education in America reached its age of maturity that state government legislators and chief executives began to become vitally concerned about developments in higher education. A major reason for this concern, of course, was financial. In 1950 our 48 state governments provided about 500 million dollars from state tax resources for the current operating support of institutions of higher education. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the corresponding figure is 3.5 billion dollars, or an increase of seven times in 17 years. In the current fiscal year 1967-68 state government appropriations for higher education purposes will mount to over 4 billion dollars.

But finances have not been the only cause of concern to state government officials. They have been equally or even more interested in what these sizable appropriations were providing. What were the state goals or objectives in higher education? How well was the state meeting these goals, and what were the major deficiencies? Where was each state government going in the field of higher education and where should it be going? With higher education ever more important to the national defense and the economic growth of the United States, these were and are vital questions.

The difficulty in obtaining answers to these questions was not so much uncertainty as a variety of responses. The president or the board of trustees of each individual public college and university in a state had his particular answer to the question where his institution was going. It was assumed that the sum total of all these particular answers constituted a state plan. This was an assumption which would not bear any close scrutiny.

The movement for state-wide planning and coordinated public higher education has been a response to dissatisfaction with the absence of adequate means for formulating and implementing a state-wide point of view about public higher education. The movement for state-wide planning and coordination of public higher education is an endeavor to provide professional administration in the state government concern with higher education is the effort to articulate a state government interest in higher education.

Let us examine for a few minutes the meaning of these phrases "state-wide planning" and "state-wide coordination" of higher education. On occasion, these words "planning and coordination" are used almost interchangeably. I believe the words mean different kinds of activities which are inter-related. Planning is concerned with needs and resources; coordination is concerned with administrative operation. At the same time, I think we may also differentiate planning and coordinating from administrative management, or in the language of higher education, "institutional government." Planning and coordination involve all the public institutions of higher education in a particular state. Institutional government involves the day-to-day operation and management of particular campuses.

Planning is a process of looking ahead, of anticipating changing social and economic conditions, of forecasting needs, of expecting problems, of projecting policies and programs to meet needs and to solve or at least to mitigate problems. In the field of higher education we have our full share of needs and problems.

In a short period of time it is impossible to dwell at any length upon the many matters in connection with higher education which deserve careful consideration. One obvious fact is that our colleges and universities are experiencing a substantial rise in enrollments. In 1940 American colleges and universities enrolled 1.5 million students. In 1950 this enrollment was over 6 million. The end is not in sight. This enrollment growth is a response not just to population expansion in the college years. Enrollment reflects even more the changing pattern of employment opportunity in this country and the rising expectation of more families who want the opportunity of higher education for their children.

Manpower experts tell us that by the mid-1970's some 50 to 55 percent of all jobs in America will require at least two years of educational preparation beyond high school. In a highly organized, a highly scientific, and a highly technological society, more education is a necessity. The labor market is closely related obviously to the production and service economy of the American people, and economic growth apparently depends upon scientific and technological development. Furthermore, we know that our national security requires more science and technology. We cannot have the science and technology we need for economic growth and national security without more higher education.

Just this month the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announced the selection of 11 new astronauts. Every one of these men had been educated to the level of a Ph.D. degree in the physical sciences, engineering, and mathematics or to the level of an M.D. degree in medicine. This selection is a forecast of things to come.

We should remember that labor market data in our country don't include the women who run the family household or staff our many private organizations on a voluntary service basis. On occasion, the fear has been voiced that we would educate too many persons for some professions. I have actually seen this happen in some foreign countries. But in the United States higher education is above all else a matter of providing professional talent to staff the needs of our complex society. And as far as any of us can look ahead at this time those needs are substantial indeed.

In our own planning by the Board of Regents in Ohio we have gone through the list of professional fields one by one to find out about the supply and demand for professional talent. We have decided that we don't need additional law schools but that we need two additional medical schools and one additional school of dentistry. We need more school teachers, more technicians. In various ways we are seeking to move ahead to meet these needs.

Planning is more than the analysis of needs and the formulation of programs to meet those needs. There are also definite issues of public policy which must be resolved. Let me site some of these. Should a state provide higher educational opportunity to out-of-state students? If so, how many should be admitted and how much should such students be charged? Should a state provide open admission to some proportion of the high school graduates? Shall open admission be provided only at certain institutions of higher education or at all of them? What should be the role of the state in providing public television, and should public television be provided through institutions of higher education? I use the phrase "public television" here with the meaning which is employed in the report of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television published in January, 1967. To what extent should higher education be provided in institutions where students attend on a residential basis and to what extent should higher education be provided in institutions where students attend on a commuting basis? To what extent should the state seek to encourage research, and how should such encouragement be undertaken?

These are simply some of the major policy issues which confront higher education and which state governments must resolve in some way for the publicly sponsored and supported institutions of a state. These policy issues involve value judgments of great importance, and they will be settled in some particular way by the decisions which are made about the creation of new institutions, about the expansion of existing institutions, and about the state financial support of higher education.

I would like to digress here for a moment to emphasize the importance of the state government role in higher education. In the past 20 years so much attention has been given to the emerging role of the federal government in higher education that the position of state government has been overlooked. The federal government has become the major force in higher education in support of scientific research in medicine, the biological sciences, the physical sciences, engineering, and mathematics. More recently the federal government has entered the field of educational research, and now promises some small support of research activities in the humanities. In conjunction with this preoccupation with research, the federal government has provided a limited number of fellowship funds for graduate study and some grants in support of graduate study. The federal government has done a good deal to expand the resources for student loans, and has more recently begun to assist in the construction of capital plant facilities.

Two observations need to be made. On the side of current operations, the federal government is providing financial support for research, for some continuing education activities in the category of public service functions of higher education, and for student aid. The most important single function of higher education, the instructional function, is not financed by the federal government insofar as current operations are concerned, except for a couple of relatively modest programs.

On the side of capital needs, the federal government has provided from one-third to one-half of certain academic and research facility requirements, has lent money at favorable rates of interest for student housing, and has provided some student loan funds.

State governments have provided the major source of instructional income for publicly sponsored institutions of higher education, have provided some limited funds for research, have provided some limited funds for public service (such as continuing education and teaching hospitals), and have provided state scholarship, tuition grant, and guaranteed loans. This last activity in support of student aid has not ordinarily been handled through public institutions of higher education but through a state-wide agency. On the capital side, state governments have provided most of the instructional plant for public institutions and some research plant. Ordinarily, state governments have not provided capital funds for auxiliary services, including intercollegiate athletics.

The point I wish to emphasize is that state governments still play an essential part in the financing of higher education and this part is not likely to diminish in the foreseeable future. Moreover, if state government financial support was reported with an intermingling of current operating appropriations and capital improvement appropriations, as is the practice in the federal government, state government support would clearly be revealed as exceeding federal government support. In addition, federal support, such as it is, is divided among private as well as public institutions of higher education.

This last comment properly returns our attention to issues of policy in state government efforts in the field of higher education. I believe that a major policy problem facing state government is its relationship to privately sponsored colleges and universities. As state financial support has moved ahead in the past 17 years, privately sponsored colleges and universities have found it increasingly difficult to obtain the financial support they have needed for their own operations. In this process the gap has widened substantially between the student charges of publicly sponsored institutions and privately sponsored institutions. For a two-semester or three-quarter academic year, state institutions of higher education charge students in general from $350 to $525, while private college and university charges range generally from $1,000 to $2,000.

It must be remembered that the number of privately sponsored colleges and universities is quite large in this country, including around 65 or 70 universities and over 900 four-year colleges and professional schools. These institutions enroll nearly 40 percent of the students in four-year degree granting institutions and graduate-professional schools. These private colleges and universities are expanding less rapidly than the public institutions, however, because they have had difficulty in obtaining the capital funds for plant expansion and the operating funds for increased enrollments. It is widely asserted that in the 1970's private colleges and universities will be enrolling 25 percent or less of all students seeking baccalaureate and advanced degrees. The federal government has done much to support research at the privately sponsored university but it has done almost nothing to support undergraduate instruction and little to support graduate or graduate-professional instruction.

As state tax support increases for the public university, there is a good deal of concern about whether state governments ought to assist private colleges and universities or not. The fact that most private colleges are church-related but obtain little church financial support is a complicating circumstance in this situation. Some states have undertaken scholarship programs with the frank intention of assisting students in meeting the fee charges of private colleges, and now there is a good deal of interest in tuition grant programs with the same purpose. I have a good deal of personal sympathy with this effort, but here I wish to underline the importance of this issue as a matter of state government policy at the present time.

Another policy matter is whether public higher education facilities and programs should be expanded in our major urban areas or whether facilities and programs should be expanded on residential campuses in small communities. I have no hesitancy in saying that I believe higher education in our country, and public higher education in particular, has not caught up with Twentieth Century urban America. Our concept of a college or university community remains attached to the pleasant campus of green grass, colonial or gothic structures, in an isolated town. Such a campus is far removed from the realities of big cities, sprawling suburbs, and major industries and business which perform the work of our present-day world. Some day, somehow, public higher education is going to have to come to grips with the facts of metropolitan life.

Here again I wish only to emphasize a problem rather than try to propound a solution or rationalize a point of view. In Ohio we have decided as a matter of state-wide planning to push the expansion of public higher education in urban areas.

Thus far I hve mentioned various planning problems which state governments must confront as they move forward with their higher education enterprise. There is one other planning concern which must not be ignored: the planning of current operating support and of capital facilities. We are hearing a great deal today about planning-programming-budgeting as a system or technique of public administration. While so-called PPBS is not as new as some would imply, the procedure is exceedingly important. A budget is the translation of plans and programs into fiscal terms and time periods. The real purpose of PPBS is to emphasize the objectives of budgeting, and to present clearly the outputs which will be realized as a consequence of particular amounts of capital facility appropriations and current operating appropriations. Too often in the past, our budget process has concentrated attention upon the objects of appropriations and not upon the objectives of appropriations, upon funds for personal services and not upon the service to be rendered, upon funds for supplies and equipment and not upon the product from their use. These deficiencies PPBS is supposed to rectify.

The name of Secretary of Defense McNamara is associated with the current development of a planning-programming-budget system. I was very much intriqued by this description of budgeting in the Department of Defense as of 1961 which appeared in the July-August 1967 issue of the Harvard Business Review (p. 112). I quote:

> "Prior to 1961 and Secretary McNamara, military budget planning was based essentially on two guide lines. The first guide line was a basic National Security Policy document which attempted to define U.S. foreign policy. The second guide line was a budget ceiling set by the President for milirary expenditures allocated as a relatively fixed percentage of the gross national product (about 10 percent in the 1950 decade with the exception of the Korean conflict).

> "With these guide lines, the service chiefs of staff were asked to split up the budget. As General Maxwell Taylor indicated: 'We put a sack worth about 40 billion dollars in front of four very earnest men and asked them to split it up.' Generally the Air Force received about 50 percent, the Navy (including the Marines) about 30 percent, and the Army about 20 percent of that kitty.
>
> "Small wonder, then, that without really clear procurement objectives and properly-coordinated planning among the services, there were redundant and, in some cases, doomed-from-concept weapon systems. And there were mission requirements receiving little or no system activity..."

What intrigues me about this description is that it is almost an exact account of the budgeting for higher education from 1953 to 1963 as I was personally acquainted with it in Ohio and as it operated without a state-wide planning and coordinating agency. To be sure, PPBS could be introduced into state government practice in the field of higher education by a state budget office, but it seems to me that such an effort would be ineffective unless it was coupled with a planning and programming procedure. Under such circumstances the state budget office could become the state-wide planning and coordinating office for higher education. I have no particular objection to this arrangement; my concern is simply to point out the importance of coupling planning and programming with budgeting.

A major purpose of the Ohio Board of Regents has been to develop a procedure for budgeting current operating expenditures and income in such a way as to emphasize outputs, and to provide the inputs required for these outputs. Furthermore, we have sought to develop an analytical procedure for relating capital plant needs to enrollments, levels of instruction, and space utilization. These procedures are in their infancy and no doubt will require nourishment and time to reach maturity. The point here again is that such procedures make sense only on a state-wide basis if state government is to be the unit of appropriation from public funds for the instructional and general programs of public higher education.

Thus far we have been considering the meaning of state-wide planning for higher education. It is time to give some attention to this word "coordination." In the lexicon of public administration, coordination has usually been thought of as a procedure for adjusting conflicts between governmental agencies having related interests and for eliminating or reducing overlapping and duplication of administrative activities. The role of the coordinator is never a very happy one; he is almost always accused of being too much concerned with mechanics of administrative operations and of being too little concerned with the substance of these operations.

It is an inevitable consequence of the administrative facts of life to experience conflict between governmental agencies. Studies in the human behavior of organizations and of the people who make up organizations have generally found that administrators are expected to protect and to expand the scope of their activities. To do otherwise is to behave contrary to the expectation of the people in an organization and to the inherent drives of any ambitious, determined administrator. The opposite of an ambitious, determined administrator is one who sits still, draws a salary, and utters pious platitudes. There have been such administrators in the public service on occasion. The wonder of our world is that there have been so few of them.

Indeed, I am not certain that conflict among administrative agencies is necessarily bad. On the contrary, conflict among colleges and universities has its constructive aspects, because there are too many forces as it is which tend to breed self-satisfaction and stagnation within an academic community. But conflict should be kept within some reasonable limits short of the mutual self-destruction of the combattants, and in government some mechanism needs to be available to adjust the most serious conflicts. In the absence of a state-wide coordinating board, this adjustment effort must be undertaken by the chief executive and general assembly of a state.

In my experience, conflicts among institutions of higher education are of several kinds. First, there are geographical conflicts, especially in the location of branch campuses and other field installations. Then there can be conflicts in admission practices and procedures, conflicts in academic policies and standards, conflicts in student policies, conflicts in policies about services to local communities in a state. As I have mentioned already, such conflicts are not necessarily undesirable. Some competition seems to me usually to be helpful rather than harmful. But conflict within and among institutions of higher education is not an edifying spectacle, and can do damage to the efforts to rally public and political support for the benefit of higher education.

There are two particular kinds of conflicts which I believe do create trouble. One is the conflict among public institutions for distribution of state appropriation support. The other is conflict between privately sponsored institutions and publicly sponsored institutions where the private institutions decry the amount of state government support available to the public institutions and argue that this support should be decreased in favor of support to themselves. I sense that this kind of conflict is on the rise in many states at the present time.

A state-wide coordinating agency cannot expect to settle or adjust every case of conflict which arises within a state between institutions of higher education. The most it can do is to select critical issues which seem to demand attention, primarily in terms of public and political interest or impact.

In addition to the adjustment of conflicts, a state-wide coordinating board is expected to watch for overlapping and duplication of activities among public institutions of higher education. One of the difficulties in this area of concern is that of defining duplication. The fact that several public institutions of higher education offer the same instructional programs is not in and of itself evidence of duplication. The problem in evaluating instructional programs is to determine the size of the demand and the relative merits in terms of cost factors in having a centralized as against a decentralized offering of various programs.

In general terms, I think our own experience in Ohio provides certain desirable guide lines in handling this concern with overlapping or duplication. Our Board of Regents has favored a considerable decentralization of instructional programs at the lower division (the freshman and sophomore) level in such standard fields as general education, technical education, arts and sciences, teacher education, and business administration. Even so, we have insisted that no facilities be built to offer lower division courses of instruction unless there is a clear prospect of a full-time equivalent enrollment of 1,000 students. Indeed, we would prefer an enrollment of 1,500 students. On the other hand, in certain more specialized fields of instruction we have found that there may be a need for only one or a few places of instruction. For example, one college of agriculture within our state university system has been sufficient to meet our needs. Our eight colleges of engineering among twelve state universities have proved sufficient to handle enrollment demand in this field.

Similarly, in every field of instruction at every level, there is a continuing necessity to examine enrollment trends, program demands, and available facilities. There are always various pressures at work to influence decisions on such matters. We believe that in Ohio we are justified in having 40 campuses in a state of over 10 million population providing instruction at the lower division level. At the same time, our Board of Regents believes that having built up to 12 campuses for upper division and graduate instructional programs, we have reached the limits of our current requirements.

The most serious problem of duplication of activity which has confronted the Ohio Board of Regents has been the question of Ph.D. programs. For a variety of reasons too complicated to explore here, our twelve state universities (one is a state-affilitated university) are inclined to believe that they should all provide extensive programs of graduate study and research for the Doctor of Philosophy degree. The problem then is how far a state government should go in providing the financial support to satisfy these institutional aspirations. This is not an easy problem to resolve.

In Ohio we have tried several approaches to the planning and coordination of Ph.D. programs. We have recognized at the outset that two of our state universities have already developed to the point of being comprehensive graduate study institutions. In the expansion of highly specialized fields of study with limited demand for Ph.D. talent, the Board of Regents prefers that one of these two universities undertake to meet these needs. Secondly, in large urban areas where there are important industrial concerns which need educated talent in various sciences, mathematics, and engineering, the Board of Regents has encouraged development of doctoral programs specifically related to these local circumstances. It is no accident, for example, that polymer science should be a major concern of the University of Akron. It is not a matter of duplication to have doctoral programs in education wherever there are considerable concentrations of public school personnel. Beyond these criteria, the Ohio Board of Regents has favored limited development of Ph.D. programs related to the demand for college faculty and other needs and in areas of specialized competence.

We have found it desirable to seek to coordinate the use of highly specialized facilities and services, such as business research, hydro-biological research, high energy physics research, technical services, library services, and similar academic efforts. Our Board of Regents believes that for budgetary reasons and reasons of academic articulation in a decentralized system it is desirable to coordinate academic calendars. I think we need to do more in the way of coordinating admission procedures in order to avoid in particular duplication in the collection of application fees. We believe it is highly desirable to coordinate the reporting of budgetary, accounting, enrollment, staffing, and space information in order that such data may be placed on a standardized, comparable basis.

Let me return at this point to my earlier enumeration of the duties of a state-wide agency of higher education. I indicated first of all that there was a need for a state-wide point of view about higher education. Actually, such a state-wide point of view is not just a need; it is a reality. Such a point of view is involved in the various decisions which are made by a chief executive, the budget officer, the finance and education committees of the state legislature, and the legislature itself. In every state, as a matter of all decisions taken up to any given moment, there is a state-wide point of view about higher education.

The real issue is whether such a point of view is the result of piecemeal decision-making or whether it reflects a master plan for coherent, comprehensive, and coordinated action. It is my experience that the pressure for the formulation and implementation of a master plan in higher education has come from executives and legislative leaders in our states. This was the origin of the Ohio Board of Regents. It is an unfortunate fact that individual institutions of higher education in our states have generally been unable to formulate a state-wide master plan on their own on a voluntary basis. Understandably, institutions of higher education are fearful of a master plan which may reflect the domination of a particularly large and powerful single public university.

The issue then is not whether there shall be a state-wide point of view about public higher education or not. This state-wide point of view does exist in the executive and legislative actions which must be taken affecting public and even private higher education. The issue is whether this state-wide point of view shall reflect a master plan formulated in terms of comprehensive and coordinated action or whether this state-wide point of view shall reflect a particularistic response to individual circumstances and demands.

With government as large as it is today, with the emmingly unending demands made for governmental services, and with resources unable to meet all these demands, executives, legislators, and administrators have turned more and more to master planning as a means for guiding the necessary decision-making. We have had master plans for the improvement of the physical facilities of our cities for some 40 years now. For 30 years we have been familiar with master plans for river basin development, for the conservation of natural resources, for the development of forest resources, for the building of highways, and even for national defense. We can only observe that the concept of master planning has come to higher education relatively late in this whole administrative development.

A word or two of caution may be worthwhile here. A master plan in and of itself can perform no miracles. Any individual master plan may be good, bad, or indifferent, depending upon the care and skill with which it is prepared, upon the realism of its approach to needs and problems, and upon its feasibility for performance. Moreover, a master plan is only a piece of paper unless it does serve as a guide line to action. And a master plan must be flexible to meet changing circumstances; a master plan must be periodically redone in the light of new knowledge and new requirements.

The other word of caution is this. The role of a master plan is not to reduce governmental expenditures. On the contrary, the immediate result of a master plan may be to increase expenditures because of bringing together needs in a clear, comprehensive whole. The purpose of a master plan is to avoid wasteful and duplicating expenditures, to fix some priorities in expenditures in terms of the relative urgency of various needs, and to help guarantee an effective output or objective of all expenditures. A master plan is not a procedure to economize in government but a procedure to improve the efficiency of government.

A second broad purpose in establishing and maintaining a state-wide agency in higher education is to provide professional leadership in formulating the state-wide point of view about public policy in this field. I have already insisted that every state government as a matter of actual practice does have a state-wide point of view about higher education. This state-wide point of view is the product of executive and legislative action. The issue is whether there shall or shall not be an agency for professional advice in making these decisions. In the past, this advice has been provided largely by the presidents of individual public institutions of higher education. For the reasons already alluded to, a state may decide it desires professional leadership from a single, objective agency.

Professionalism arises from education and experience. As knowledge expands and becomes more highly specialized, as more and more action in society is effective only in terms of professional skill, the role of the amateur and the generalist has become more restricted. In simpler days the executive and the legislature were competent to resolve conflicts, to coordinate action, to make necessary decisions. Executives and ligislatures must still make the necessary decisions, and must still scrutinize professional advice with care. But in field after field—mental health, highway safety, law enforcement, agricultural services, banking and insurance regulation, taxation, finance, public welfare—executives and legislators expect and welcome professional advice. Higher education has become sufficiently important, sufficiently complicated, and sufficiently expensive to warrant some administrative arrangement for providing this professional advice.

Finally, let me say a few words about the desirability of articulating the state interest in public higher education. There is no greater need today, I am convinced, than to make explicit the reasons why it is in the public interest to expand the opportunity for higher education and to expand the scope of our higher education activity. Unfortunately, our colleges and universities often appear little interested in defining the public interest in higher education.

It is continually a source of amazement to me how many persons there are in our academic communities who are so indifferent or insensitive to public reaction to various academic statements and practices. Yet these same individuals are convinced that the public ought to have a greater appreciation of their worth and that the political authorities ought to provide more funds for their support.

We Americans have long believed that education is a good thing. The founding fathers of our Republic and of our constitutional form of government were convinced that education was an essential qualification for citizen participation in government, and as the privilege of voting was extended to an ever larger number of persons, education became essential for democracy. In large part we still consider elementary and secondary education as a vital corollary of universal suffrage.

But education, particularly higher education, has had another purpose. The colonial colleges were concerned about the professional preparation of individuals to become ministers and then lawyers. In time, a variety of professions required a broadened scope and more intensive effort for professional education on the part of higher education. I think it is accurate to assert that higher education has as its first goal today the proper education of individuals to enter the many professions which our society requires.

There are some persons who think of higher education primarily in terms of the individual, in terms of the development of the skill and knowledge of an individual to the fullest extent consistent with that individual's abilities and interests. I would agree with this statement of purpose if at the same time we recognize that the objective in acquiring knowledge is to enable an individual to wear the mantle of learning not as a personal adornment but as a means for contributing to the welfare of others. There have been societies where learning was the privilege of an elite who were removed from the necessity to earn a living and dwelt in luxury from the exploited labor of others. In our society learning is not a privilege but an opportunity, and knowledge is not just a personal satisfaction but a responsibility for service to one's fellow beings. We Americans have a pragmatic and utilitarian view of higher education, and I hope we shall maintain this.

But professional education alone is not the whole purpose of higher education today. The expansion of knowledge has been indispensable to our health, our material comfort, our economic growth, our national security, our solution of many problems from population and pollution to poverty. We can advance our capacity to cope with these problems only through research, formal education, and continuing education.

It is easy to state these abstractions. It is another thing to present the concrete reality behind them. It is easy for persons in higher education to communicate with each other. It is another thing to communicate the reality of higher education to citizens, to voters, to representatives of the people. I believe strongly that those who live within the world of higher education must do far more than in the past to build bridges of understanding with the larger world of which they are a part and upon which they depend for sustenance.

State government today needs, I believe, a state agency to help articulate the public interest in higher education. If this public interest is not described, explained, and demonstrated in practical ways, then we cannot expect state government to continue indefinitely to augment the resources it is willing to devote to the support of higher education.

It must be obvious from these comments that I have been converted to a strong belief in the necessity for state-wide planning and coordination in higher education. Of this I am convinced. My concern is that those of us engaged in such state-wide planning and coordination may not be adequate to our high calling, to the challenges of our times. Civilization is still a race between education and chaos. It is a race education cannot afford to lose.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: ITS FOUNDATION AND STRUCTURE

by
Dana B. Hamel

Our society demands that we provide more educational opportunities for the people of our respective states. This must be done at all levels, for all of the people—this is abundantly clear.

We, here, are concerned with higher education, or the post-high school needs at the two-year level.

EVOLUTION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Two-year post-high school education is not a new concept. Early in the 1800's a general movement began for the education and welfare of working men; mechanics institutes were an outgrowth of this movement. The first institute in America was established in 1820 when the General Society of Mechanics Tradesmen of the City of New York opened a library for apprentices and established a mechanics school.

The second mechanics institute, and most famous, was the Franklin Institute of Philadelphia, founded in 1824. Three years later a similar institute was organized in Boston. There were others, which include the Mechanics Institute of Glasgow (1823) and London (1824); Gardner, Maine (Lyceum, 1822); The Maryland Institute of Baltimore (1825) and the Ohio Mechanics Institute (Cincinnati, 1828). It was considered necessary then, as it is now to the progress and prosperity of the country, that the sciences, which had been taught up to this time only in seminaries, should be made accessible to all who possessed taste and talent to develop them.

During the latter part of the 1800's many university presidents and other educators talked about the need for a new institution of higher education. This led to the junior college movement. The community junior college in the United States dates from the turn of the century and is considered to be one of the uniquely "American" contributions to higher education. In 1900 there were eight junior colleges; in 1950 there were 597; now there are over 800 two-year institutions classified as junior colleges. They continue to grow at the rate of 50 new institutions per year, and almost every state is in the process of establishing a system of community colleges.

Dr. Hamel is Director, Virginia Department of Community Colleges.

There are differences between the older schools and the newer ones. In the early part of the twentieth century the junior colleges, which were the forerunner of the community college, were usually private, select institutions and were often known as finishing schools for young men and women. Many were church related with strong emphasis on religious training. These institutions specialized in the liberal arts with many of the students planning to transfer to a four-year institution. They have progressed in their philosophy and their orientation and are now mostly public supported and are broadly developed to serve the larger needs of the community.

Since the modest beginning 65 years ago these two-year colleges have become the fastest growing segment of higher education in America. It is also interesting to note that these institutions now enroll over one million and a half students.

Most states had developed extensive public two-year college programs prior to 1965. Some southern states with extensive junior college programs in the 1920's and 1930's were Mississippi and Texas. By the late 1950's and early 1960's Florida and North Carolina were also developing junior college systems.

ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The role of two-year post-high school programs in any state system of higher education has many and varied purposes. One is meeting the needs of students who, for whatever reason, do not go to a four-year institution. Many reasons are known to you. They can't afford it, they aren't ready, they just can't do the work at the four-year level, they don't know or aren't sure what they want to do or be, they may want something other than a four-year program, they may have family commitments, they are technically competent but academically weak, or they may be just plain old "late bloomers." The community college also plays a role in the adult world by providing special training for industry, business and the professions. Adult education, especially for those who need more or different education, is another function of the community college.

The role of these programs also speaks to the obvious needs which you are facing in your states—finding employment for your citizens. The great basic requirement for employment today is education and training. Without education and training you can't work, and you are dangerous to the whole of society. A high school education is almost useless for employment. Today our employers demand more than a high school education, but a multitude of these jobs do not require a baccalaureate degree.

More and more people have a need for higher education of a useful kind, and the community college is helping to meet this need. You are facing this issue now in your states. The solution is not easy since our four-year institutions and graduate schools must not dilute their abilities too far. The universities of today are growing at a remendous rate causing many states to place a ceiling on campus size to keep them from becoming education factories. Some states are also developing senior institutions which will offer only junior, senior and graduate level college work. The need for community colleges is demonstrated by the increasing demand on our four-year institutions for admission in already over-crowded facilities.

Identification of the purposes and function of each type of institution and its contribution to the whole of higher education can be a problem. Generally the role, with overlapping in some cases, provides that the universities devote themselves to graduate and professional, research and extension functions. The state colleges provide basically baccalaureate programs and the community colleges are basically providing the freshman and sophomore level programs.

The smooth transfer of students, when qualified, to senior institutions is another major function which must constantly be reviewed by both levels of education.

There are mutual opportunities in the use of educational television and cooperative efforts are indicated on library loans.

Finally, joint use of space when possible is necessary. For example, the Virginia Community College System provides classroom and laboratory space for senior institutions who wish to offer extension programs and courses in a community.

The role then is distinctly that of higher education. There is little doubt about the programs being beyond high school; their identity is that of the "adult world," the "I have left high school" atmosphere.

IMPLEMENTATION

To implement the role we will need a good system of post-high school institutions. The comprehensive community college is that institution. "A good community college," according to Dr. Edmund Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, "will be honestly, gladly, and clearly a community institution. It is in and of the community. Among its offerings are short courses, institutes, conferences, clinics, forums, concerts, exhibits, studies, basic college work, vocational technical courses, continuing education, all related to community needs."

We, in Virginia, respectfully submit that the community college program should be designed to serve the educational needs of qualified post-high school age youth and adults in order to prepare them for employment, for advanced collegiate education, and for improved citizenship. A community college means a comprehensive institution of higher education offering programs of instruction generally extending not more than two years beyond the high school level which should include, but not be limited to, courses in occupational and technical fields, the liberal arts and sciences, general education, continuing adult education, pre-college and pre-technical preparatory programs, special training programs to meet the economic needs of the region in which the college is located, and other services to meet the cultural and educational needs of this region.

A good comprehensive community college should be planned to include at least the following programs:

1. Occupations-Technical Education. The occupational and technical education programs need to be designed to meet the increasing demand for technicians, semiprofessional workers, and skilled craftsmen for employment in industry, business, the professions, and government.

2. University Parallel-College Transfer Education. The university parallel-college transfer program includes college freshman and sophomore courses in arts and sciences and pre-professional programs meeting standards acceptable for transfer to baccalaureate degree programs in four-year colleges and universities.

3. General Education. The programs in general education encompass the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by each individual to be effective as a person, a member of a family, a worker, a consumer, and a citizen.

4. Continuing Adult Education. Adult education programs are offered to enable the adults in the region to continue their learning experiences. This work includes both degree credit and non-degree credit work offered during the day and evening hours.

5. Preparatory (Foundation) Programs. Foundation and developmental programs are offered to help prepare individuals for admission to the university parallel-college transfer program and to occupational-technical program in the community college. These programs are designed to help the individual develop the basic skills and understandings necessary to succeed in other programs of the community college.

6. Specialized Regional and Community Services. The facilities and personnel of the college are available to provide specialized services to help meet the cultural and educational needs of the region served by the community college. This service includes the non-classroom and non-credit programs, cultural events, workshops, meetings, lectures, conferences, seminars, and special community projects which are designed to provide needed cultural and educational opportunities for the citizens of the region.

7. A strong guidance and counseling program.

Finally, the good community colleges will award the Associate in Arts degree, the Associate in Science degree, the Associate in Applied Science degree, diplomas, and certificates to students who complete planned programs at the community colleges.

TYPES OF TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

There are a variety of public-supported two-year post-high school institutions. These are known by various names such as technical institutes, area vocational schools, junior colleges, branches of four-year colleges and universities, industrial education centers, and comprehensive community colleges. Some states have had most of these types of institutions in operation at the same time—all competing for the same tax dollar. For instance, it sometimes happens that a community has an area vocational school and several miles away a junior college or branch of the university. I suggest that such an arrangement is not in the best interest of the taxpayer and is not the best expenditure of his tax money.

The comprehensive community college can and does bring together the functions of these diverse post-high school programs into one unified operation. Thus, the community college can provide a quality program and a financial savings through:

1. A single administration—eliminating the duplication of scarce staff members.

2. Combined physical facilities designed for maximum use—eliminating the duplication of expensive facilities and equipment.

3. Providing an opportunity for students to switch from program to program within one institution without loss of credit, time, prestige, or social standing.

4. An opportunity for students in occupational and technical fields to obtain a broader general education which should lead to the development of more productive workers and more responsible citizens.

There can be disadvantages to a comprehensive community college. For example, the attitude of the administration and faculty can be oriented toward only one type of program, such as the liberal arts, and thus be a deterring influence on the development of a truly comprehensive program.

We must constantly strive to provide competent leadership committed to operating an institution which will provide a variety of educational opportunities for all of our citizens—not just a specialized program for a select few.

A state system can have both advantages and disadvantages. Some of the advantages to be considered are the following:

1. Better coordination of programs and offerings.

2. Elimination of unnecessary and needless duplication of facilities and programs.

3. Adequate financing for all areas of a state—even the poorest regions.

4. The ability to provide expertise and leadership for a single institution and/or all institutions in the state.

5. Coordinating responsibility for the best expenditure of the tax dollar.

6. By utilizing state tax funds for higher education, local tax funds can be devoted to the improvement and expansion of local public school systems (grades kindergarten through twelve).

There can also be disadvantages to a state system of community colleges:

1. If not properly organized or if there is poor leadership state needs may dominate local needs. (This must not be permitted to happen).

2. Archaic state regulations may impede purchasing processes, employment of personnel, budgeting, and other related functions. (A state government must modernize its procedures to prevent this from happening).

MODEL FOR A STATE PROGRAM

Finally, we feel that Virginia has an ideal working model for a state system of community colleges. While Virginia's system is not perfect since it is in an embryonic stage, many of the problems are being eliminated as growth takes place.

An independent State Board for Community Colleges has been created for the establishment, control, and administration of all comprehensive community colleges. They are empowered to promulgate the necessary rules and regulations for carrying out their purposes. They also have the responsibility for preparing and adminstering a plan which will provide the standards and policies for the establishment, development and administration of these colleges. They are charged with recognizing the need for excellence in all curricula and with establishing and maintaining standards appropriate to the various purposes of the respective programs.

A department has been instituted which has as its main function that of carrying out the policies, procedures, and regulations of the State Board for Community Colleges.

There can be a danger here of too much central control and the key to the problem is providing enough opportunity for local involvement so that the effort at this grass roots stage continues. This can be done through a system of local advisory committees.

The role of the local advisory board has been defined by us as follows:

> Powers and duties. The local community college advisory board should perform such duties with respect to the operation of a community college as may be delegated to it by the State Board for Community Colleges. The powers and duties of this local advisory board include the following:
>
> a) The local advisory board shall elect a chairman and other such officers from its membership as it deems necessary.
>
> b) The local advisory board shall serve as the liaison agency between the State Board for Community Colleges and the governing body(s) of the local political subdivision(s).
>
> c) The local advisory board shall be responsible for promoting the development and implementation of an adequate program of community college education under the administration and supervision of the State Board for Community Colleges.
>
> d) The local advisory board shall be responsible for eliciting community participation in program planning and development.
>
> e) Upon the recommendation of the president of the community college, the local advisory board shall approve all appointments of members to local advisory committees for specialized programs and curricula.
>
> f) The local advisory board shall encourage community support of the college and its program, including the encouragement of local financial contributions from the local political subdivisions and other agencies for funds to supplement the basic facilities and programs provided by the State Board for Community Colleges.
>
> g) The local advisory board shall review the annual budget as prepared by the local community college president and the State Department of Community Colleges and forward its recommendation on the budget to the State Board for Community Colleges.

These duties will be reviewed every two years and as mutual experience is gained more responsibility and authority will devolve upon the local boards.

There are also citizens advisory committees for each specialized curriculum to aid the administration and local board in their responsibility to see that curricula meet the local needs of business, industry and the professions.

In order to provide for the involvement of local staff and faculty in the development of programs and policies a number of significant steps have been taken:

(1) An Advisory Council of Community College Presidents has been established to provide advice to the State Director. Their recommendations cover all phases of the operation of the colleges.

(2) Faculty Advisory Committees have been established to provide recommendations at the local level and the state level on curriculums, instructional methods and materials, and policies related to faculty.

(3) A Curriculum Development Laboratory has been established to spawn ideas for creative and innovative programs.

(4) The faculty and staff of the Virginia Community College System are included as members of every major committee on higher education in Virginia.

In our opinion, an important asset to any state program of higher education is an adequate coordinating authority—an agency designed to serve, (1) in an advisory capacity to the governor and the state legislature and to the educators, and (2) in a leadership capacity for the development of quality programs of higher education. Again it can be stated that all programs of higher education—universities, state colleges and community colleges—need to be coordinated in order to provide for an equitable distribution of tax funds in this very competitive situation. The splended cooperation exhibited in Virginia on the part of the State Council of Higher Education is worthy of emulation in all states. It would have been impossible to develop our fine system without the active help and support of our State Council and the four-year colleges and universities.

Articulation committees have been established under the sponsorship of the State Council. These committees have established general guidelines which provide the basis for a smooth transition of students transferring from a community college to a senior college or university.

In conclusion, any system offering two-year post-high school education is only as effective as its ability to serve the educational needs of the people. We in Virginia, thanks to the help of many fine people from other states, including states represented at this meeting, are of the opinion that we have one of the finest systems of comprehensive community colleges in the country. Through the leadership of the Honorable Mills E. Godwin, Governor of Virginia, and members of both houses of the State Legislature, many people in Virginia will have opportunities for education and training that would not have been available without this program. It is this fact that encouraged us at the outset of the Community College System—it has continued to hearten our efforts—and in time I know it will gladden our recollections.

THE ROLE AND STATUS OF STATE COLLEGES IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

by
Glenn S. Dumke

I. What are characteristics of the state colleges today?

The state college-type institutions are and will be the fastest-growing segment of public higher education in the nation. They serve more than one out of five of all students in higher education; between 1954 and 1964, enrollment at public universities increased 112 percent, while public liberal arts colleges increased 204.4 percent.

With origins in the normal school or teachers college, the state college or state university, as it is sometimes called, has gradually broadened its offerings to match (within legally prescribed limitations) the range and level of the land grant university or major state institution.

Basically liberal arts institutions, the state colleges offer general education in subjects such as language and literature, physical and natural sciences, fine arts and social. Programs leading to professional or occupational preparation in a wide variety of fields, including teaching, engineering, agriculture, social work, business and medical technology are also offered.

The state colleges are primarily undergraduate institutions. Many of them offer the master's degree and beyond, and some have large and highly effective graduate-level operations.

Aside from the phenomenal growth of the state colleges in recent years and the consequent broadening of their offerings, the single most characteristic aspect of the state colleges nationwide is their diversity. In size, program offerings, admissions requirements, academic emphasis, physical plant and facilities, service to the state or region—in short, in almost every aspect of college operations—the state colleges tend to be individualistic, each with a personality and identity unique to itself.

II. What are the strengths and abilities of the state college?

It is axiomatic that the fundamental strength of the state colleges is their emphasis on teaching. With their heritage as teacher-training institutions, they have continued to emphasize good teaching as their first responsibility.

Dr. Dumke is Chancellor, The California State Colleges.

The ramifications of the teaching emphasis are manifold. Faculty who excel at teaching are sought to staff the classrooms. Students have the opportunity to study under senior professors at the lower division level; the time in their college careers when the assistance of experienced instructors is most important. Physical plant provides small classrooms and maximum opportunity for faculty-student contact. The fact that the state colleges are thus student-centered has prevented, to a large degree, the student discontent and dislocation experienced at some other types of institutions.

Less obvious, but almost as important as the teaching emphasis, is the flexibility of the state colleges to innovate. Less hampered by tradition, the state colleges are freer to experiment with the new and untried in academic organization, curricular development, instructional methods and faculty-student-administration relationships. Coupled with their flexibility, their close association with the region in which they exist makes the state college more responsive to regional needs in program and manpower production.

Obviously, the state colleges are more economical to operate than the research-oriented institutions with their high-cost professional and graduate programs. This, too, must be considered a strength, for it is at the heart of the state's ability to support mass education at the college level.

III. How is the state college governed?

Governance of the state college, in most instances, has followed the lay citizen board method, which over the years has proved to be one of America's soundest contributions to educational administration. Experts are virtually unanimous in support of the lay board as the best method of adademic government, provided the authority given the board by the state is commensurate with its responsibility to manage the affairs of the institution.

In some cases, state colleges and other types of higher education institutions have been governed by political arms or agencies of the state, but this approach has proved both ineffective and unwise, involving as it does bureaucratic frustrations and political encroachment.

In states which support more than one segment of higher education institutions, such as several junior colleges, state colleges and public universities, it is submitted that a separate, independent board for each segment is the most successful method of governance, working under some sort of coordinating machinery. While the single board method, in which one board governs all segments, is practiced in a number of states, too often the result has been inequitable treatment of the segments to the end that a favored segment experiences healthy growth while the growth of other segments is stunted.

IV. What are the problems they face?

The root of many of the problems faced by state colleges today can be stated in three words—inadequate financial support. To fully appreciate this root problem it must be placed in the context of the enormously difficult tasks assigned the colleges. In California, for example, the state colleges educate two-thirds of the students in four-year public institutions and receive one-third of the higher education budget.

There are a number of causes of this problem, some obvious and some not so obvious: (1) the pressure on the tax dollar itself, (2) the rapid growth of the colleges in both numbers and maturity which has outpaced their public recognition, (3) favoritism to older land-grant institutions by their powerful alumni and constituencies, (4) subordinate legal positions in state educational hierarchies which tend to freeze the state colleges into a status of permanent second-class citizenship in terms of support for educational programs, research, and faculty salaries and benefits, (5) inflexibility in state financial control procedures which often puts educational decisions in the hands of fiscal technicians, (6) roadblocks thrown up by private and land-grant institutions to the solicitation of private funds to augment state support. While there are problems before the state colleges which are more complex, requiring more subtle solutions, none but fiscal support is nuclear to the effective operation of a sound educational program.

The other problems of a serious nature concern group relationships and governance. In brief, the state colleges are confronted with the same problems faced by all of higher education, yet because of their size and undernourishment the problems tend to become aggravated. Among these are: (1) attempts to unionize faculty with all which that implies in terms of militant and disruptive labor tactics, (2) attempts by students and faculty to use colleges as a staging area for political activism, (3) the perennial but increasing tension between faculty and administration as the faculty moves for increased power, (4) pressure from the state government to administer the colleges, strictly and in accordance with accepted social standards when, indeed, many of those standards are in retreat and others are under attack in the community at large. By no means an exhaustive enumeration of these problems, this list is intended to convey an impression of areas of sensitive administrative concern.

V. What are the solutions to those problems?

Obviously, increased state support will solve to a large extent the root problems of undernourishment of state colleges. But the root problem will not be eliminated until the causes of that problem, as outlined above, are successfully attacked. To achieve this, state colleges will have to do it themselves. They will have to win public recognition and respect. They will have to earn the trust of the legislative and executive branches of state government. They will have to build a strong and effective constituency base to assist in achieving their legitimate goals. They will have to continue the fight to achieve fiscal authority and flexibility commensurate with their responsibility.

In states where the orderly growth of public higher education is not controlled by a coordinating body, the state college-type institutions should work to establish such an agency to protect themselves from reverse favoritism.

In states in which there is a legal impediment to the full realization of the potential of the state colleges, such as heavy statutory or fiscal controls or single-board dominance, the state colleges must actively campaign for the status and freedom required to accomplish their mission.

They must take every step to achieve full first-class citizenship for their faculties in terms of salaries, fringe benefits and research opportunities to the end that the students may be well served. If the state colleges are destined to educate more students than any other institution, they should have the very best faculties—not second-raters or cast-offs from the universities, or people who are paid less because they prefer to teach.

The state colleges also must wage an educational campaign in Washington to achieve their fair share of federal funds, which are now going almost exclusively to a handful of large institutions.

The state colleges must take a leadership role in educational innovation to assist in solving the support problem. They must do their job better and more efficiently.

The state colleges must continue critical self-studies of their entire educational process. Experimental programs must break the traditional lockstep sequence and the mass anonymity which threaten present-day higher education. They must experiment with exciting new programs and methods which will meet tomorrow's, not yesterday's needs. The essence of learning is change—state colleges cannot allow paperwork, bureaucracy and the problems of mass society to rob them of this academic birthright. State colleges must maintain a climate of innovation and experimentation—a willingness, even an eagerness, to try new ideas, new methods, new programs. For the state colleges of the nation there must be created what Alfred North Whitehead has called "the habitual vision of greatness."

As to the problems of relationships and governance cited above, there are, of course, no pat answers or formulas. It is my personal belief, however, that the communications gap between students and the college, between the college and the community, between the students and the faculty, and between the faculty and administration is widening and that these problems will become more serious until that gap is narrowed. The public colleges of today do not exist in an Andy Hardy world of jalopies, apple-dunking and spring fever. They exist in a seriously-oriented pressurized atmosphere of social and world struggle, of pressure groups, of power-seeking and serious moral decline.

The state colleges as all institutions of higher education today must face up to their challenges.

They must confront the fact that this is a revolutionary time in history when the basic danger is not change, but wholesale change in which the good is cast aside along with the bad.

VI. What does the future hold for the state colleges?

The state colleges are destined to play a vital role in the nation's educational future. It could be a precarious one, however, unless the rapid growth of state college-type institutions is matched by proper planning and adequate support.

Here are some of the developments the future holds:

1. Continued rapid growth which will reach phenomenal proportions in some states. In California, for example, in 15 years we foresee 25 state colleges with a combined enrollment of 300,000.

2. Operating costs per student will be substantially higher, but not as high as those of research-oriented universities. This will result from a combination of factors: inflation, higher salaries for college personnel, and a higher proportion of upper-division and graduate students.

   Also, the cost will and should be increased by some filling of the fiscal gap between inadequate and adequate support suffered by many state colleges for a number of years.

3. The alumni of state colleges will make up a significant part of the leaders and managers of our communities, states and nation. Eventually, because of their large numbers, they may well predominate in decision-making in business, industry, government, and public affairs. Their influence ultimately will reflect greater strength for the colleges in constituent and state support.

4. State colleges will be more widely recognized for their superiority in teaching and for the all-around quality of their academic programs. They will also receive increased recognition and support for research—research that is appropriate to the teaching function.

5. The traditional role of state colleges in the preparation of teachers will be even more important than it is today as education gains increasing significance in national life and national policy. The strong, mature state colleges will soon be granting doctorates, particularly teaching doctorates which are so desperately needed, but which existing graduate schools seem unwilling to support.

6. State colleges will move more in the direction of cooperative arrangements with other institutions, both public and private, for sharing complex and costly facilities for special programs, scarce faculty resources, libraries and cultural programs.

CASE STUDY: HOW CALIFORNIA ORGANIZED PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

California is discussed all over the nation as one state which has gone a long way toward solving its higher education problems. Six years ago it devised a way for its universities, state colleges and junior colleges to live together in reasonable harmony--and with concern for the welfare of the taxpayer. This was called the Master Plan for Higher Education, and it has become more or less of a Magna Carta in its field. It has worked, and worked well. Other states, and even foreign nations, are examining the California Master Plan and copying parts of it. States which are baffled by problems of higher educational financing would do well to study it.

The Master Plan was drawn up for one very simple reason—there is no larger financial drain on public dollars than the unbridled fiscal demands of rapidly growing public colleges and universities. In the late 1950's there was a serious question in the minds of Californians as to whether the state could continue to offer a free public college education to all of its young people. The state's population was increasing at a rate of more than 1,500 persons *per day*; the city of Los Angeles had to build a new school every *week* to keep up with the demand; and college and university budgets were rising astronomically.

A team of experts was set up to study the problem. They represented the state university, the state colleges, the junior colleges, and even private education, because one basic purpose of the Master Plan was to put *all* of the state's higher educational resources to the best possible use. The team worked for nine months, and finally gave birth to a proposal which was essentially simple in concept, but which tackled the problem of college and university financing in a way it had never been done before.

This fundamentally simple concept was called "differentiation of function." It meant that certain types of institutions had certain jobs to do, that no college or university could or should be "all things to all men." The consequence was that competition for the tax dollar for the purpose of unnecessarily duplicating each other's efforts would be reduced to a minimum. The struggle between universities and state colleges which had occurred in so many other states as the state colleges had moved toward university status, and as the universities had tried to keep the colleges from threatening their prestige or support, was eliminated. For once the taxpayers and the students and the principle of academic quality had been given priority over the empire-building proclivities of educators, and of legislators who wanted higher education facilities in their districts.

The situation in California, before the Master Plan, had all of the menacing tensions of the night before a battle. The state university, already a famous and prestigious institution, was busily expanding, not only monopolizing the state's budget for research, but building a vast undergraduate empire as well. The state colleges, with non-selective admission standards, were capitalizing on the legislators' enthusiasm for educational expansion by growing so fast that academic quality was threatened. The junior colleges, some excellent, some poor and weak, were developing in many different directions, and were not certain whether they were a part of higher or secondary education.

The Master Plan confronted these problems squarely, and provided simple, basic answers. The state university's mission, it said, was graduate education and research. The bevatrons, cyclotrons, linear accelerators, and costly research libraries were functions of the university. The Plan implied that no new university should be built unless a new graduate school or research facility was needed. Because educators are in general agreement that a good graduate school needs an undergraduate base, if only to provide teaching assignments for its graduate students, the university was to have undergraduate colleges, but only under a highly selective admissions requirement. The university was not to build an undergraduate empire.

The state colleges' mission, on the other hand, was teaching. The state colleges were to instruct the vast majority of students who desired bachelor's degrees and were to offer master's level education as well. Just as a good graduate school requires a reasonable undergraduate base, so also does a good undergraduate college require a reasonable graduate superstructure to satisfy the aspirations of faculty members who desire work with graduate students, and to eliminate any odor of "second-class citizenship" in relation to the university. In addition to master's degree work, the state colleges were made part of a "joint doctoral program," which enabled them, in cooperation with the university, to utilize existing faculties and facilities at this advanced level in a restrained manner. Academic quality was bolstered by raising admissions requirements, elimination of prohibitions against research (although state college research had to be related to improvement of teaching), and strong support of higher faculty salaries and prerequisites. But just as large funds would be saved by the university's staying out of the race for undergraduate campuses, comparable funds would be saved by the state colleges' not competing for advanced graduate research facilities.

The junior colleges were to limit themselves to two-year educational programs, and were given a dual mission—that of preparing larger numbers of students than ever before for transfer to state college, university and private college, and that of providing vocational, terminal programs for students whose capabilities and aspirations lay along practical rather than scholarly lines.

To insure the carrying out of the Master Plan, a coordinating council was set up, consisting of representatives of the university, state colleges, junior colleges, private colleges and the lay public. This council, which has a permanent director and staff located in the state capital, has three major jobs: adjudication of disputes over differentiation of function;

study and recommendations on the building of new university and state college campuses; and recommendations to the governor and legislature each year on the level of support for higher education. The council is working, and working well, and although representatives of each higher education segment occasionally are stung when the council says "No!"—it is saying "No!"—and making it stick. Everyone agrees that this is its job.

Why has the Master Plan worked?

One big reason is that the state colleges, which in many states have been forced into second-class citizenship by single board arrangements, have been given a strong academic government of their own, and an opportunity to achieve high academic respectability, equal to that of the university, within the ambit of their own teaching mission. In states where the state colleges have been forced into a subordinate position by a single board, which inevitably favors the university, they have either seethed and fumed under a situation in which they could not maintain their academic or faculty quality, or they have burst their fetters and become second-rate state universities, competing for state funds to duplicate graduate research facilities in a futile and wasteful battle for prestige and federal funds.

Another reason is that the university has not been given an absolutely dominant position in the state's higher educational pattern. It too has its restraints and sphere of influence.

A third reason is that the strong junior college system of the state has been given large responsibilities for freshman and sophomore education, and this enabled both university and state colleges to be more selective in their admissions requirements, reducing dropouts.

California now has nine university campuses, eighteen state colleges and about seventy-five junior colleges with a total student population of well over a third of a million. Higher education is big business, with university and state college budgets alone totaling more than half a billion a year. It is fairly safe to say that without the Master Plan, these figures would be up at least a fourth, and maybe a third. The taxpayer has much to be thankful for. And so does the student.

With the state colleges and junior colleges devoted to teaching rather than research, students in California's public higher educational system do not have the situation which prevails in many other states, where, under single-board arrangements, the university dominates and the teaching institutions get only second- or third-rate faculty members; or, where state colleges have become second-rate universities and afflict their younger students, who require the best teaching, with inexperienced research-oriented teaching assistants.

One evidence that California's Master Plan is working well is that many vested interests are attacking it. If the critics prevail, California too will fall into the morass which is public higher education in many other states of the nation. On the other hand, if the people and the students and the legislature continue to recognize, as they seem willing to do, that California pioneered something unique in its Master Plan which squarely confronted basic problems with simple answers, then California will continue to have, as it has today, one of the nation's best and strongest systems of higher education, both public and private, and one which is serving well both the state and the nation.

THE MISSION OF THE COMPLEX UNIVERSITY IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

by
John W. Oswald

INTRODUCTION

A Legislative Work Conference focused on education is particularly pertinent in this decade and for those decades to come. Perhaps other eras have had priorty concern in the legislatures for finances, for governmental structure, for public utilities. However, the growing recornition of the role of education in our country's development, and of the complicated needs of the public educational enterprise involves the concern of legislatures perhaps as never before. Particularly is this true in the South with our special heritage, our special circumstances, our special opportunities.

I therefore welcome the opportunity to prepare for this group some observations related to a particular phase of our educational endeavor, the large complex public university, relevant to all our lives and to the future of our region and of our nation. I propose to discuss the four-pronged mission of a complex university in the realm of public higher education and the issues these arouse, which directly concern the responsibilities of legislators.

PUBLIC ORIGINS

As background, it may be pointed out that the public institutions of higher education had rather specialized origins, in many cases different from their contemporary private institutions. Many of the great American private institutions were patterned after the scholarly retreats of European universities or were founded to promote vocations in religion, law, teaching, and medicine, often related to a particular religious position. The Anglo or English origin of higher education, going back to Oxford and Cambridge, encouraged a group of individuals referred to as scholars to gather around them some of the elite of that society, privileged socially, financially, and intellectually. These groups discussed, learned, speculated on problems, and out of these associations grew the so-called community of scholars. But in those early days, and to a certain extent even now, institutions of that character made a point of remaining aloof from society, of feeling that they could not be the critic and the evaluator of a society of which they themselves were actually a part. This came to be, for some, the familiar issue of division of "town and gown."

Dr. Oswald is President, University of Kentucky.

On the other hand, many of our state-supported institutions of higher education go back to a century or a little more in our own American society. Now we find the modern complex state university quite different from the English origin and the American version of the English origin. Particularly our land-grant schools were related to a rural society, with the special kinds of problems attendant to a rural society. In this context, the mission of a university such as the University of Kentucky was, for the first 75 years or so of its existence, a rather simple mission in contract to the missions of the complex university today. It, and many schools similar to it, had a mission to provide an undergraduate education for an increasing number of people, those who could not afford the traditional kind of private education. These institutions extended educational opportunity to the many as contrasted to the fortunate few.

Now, a century later, in the year 1967 as we look forward to the increasing and probably inevitable growth of the complex state university, it is erroneous to refer to the mission or even the one or two missions of these institutions. Their early missions were, first, concern with undergraduate education, and next, supporting service to the agricultural part of our society, the rural population. These complex state universities today have additional public assignments resulting from new needs of the society they serve and new expectations of the citizenry.

The original missions of the state universities have not diminished in importance but the additional assignments have complicated the role and status of these agencies in our society.

Now let us deal in some detail with these present day missions of higher education in our public system of education, including the inherent tension within and among the various missions and with examples of dealing constructively with our tasks.

THE UNDERGRADUATE MISSION

Of course, the major mission of the public university continues to be the education of undergraduates, and this we discuss first. We have been made well aware of the phenomenon of increasing numbers in enrollment. In our own University of Kentucky, having just completed a centennial year, perspective indicates that within the first ten years of the second century, we will more than double the enrollment level gradually attained in our first 100 years. On the national scene, figures indicate that in 1959 about three million young men and women were in college. This year the figure is around six million (almost double in less than 10 years), and the figure is expected to be close to nine million by 1973-74. The major mission of undergraduate education is tightly interlocked with the problem of numbers and is of immediate and familiar concern to legislators. Can our institutions financially, physically, and effectively grow to accomodate these numbers?

The mission is complicated not only by numbers at the undergraduate level; there is also the variety of curricula to be provided at the undergraduate level. We are finding that as our society becomes more complex and more specialized, additional and new curricula are relevant and needed. Certainly when I was in college we did not have opportunities or need for computer science, oceanography, developmental change and other aspects of group dynamics, for example, and we really hadn't thought of these fields of investigation as disciplines in themselves.

In addition to numbers and to variety of curricula, the undergraduate mission of the university has other complications which concern educators. There is a legitimate concern that in the process of responding to the specialization, the curriculum is over specializing itself. In some cases an education is made up of bits and pieces of the specialized information to suit a person here or there, at the cost of some of those marks of a broadly educated young man or young woman. The educated person needs not only special knowledge but also the ability to reason, the ability to differentiate prejudice from reason, the ability to differentiate opinion from fact, and even further along the line to differentiate the sterile acquiring of knowledge from the wise use of knowledge.

We therefore see that the original and important mission of the state university to provide education for the undergraduates is confounded by increasing numbers, variety of disciplines, and the needs and changes of specialization.

THE GRADUATE MISSION

The second mission of the public institution of higher education evolves from undergraduate education and the complexity of knowledge. This is the mission of providing academic work beyond the baccalaureate level. Indeed, many, many colleges in this country in a sense now seem to measure their success or failure in terms of how many of their students go on to graduate work.

This is really a response to what is happening in our society, again related to specialization. When many of us were in college a chemistry major could very well go on to a very well known chemical firm with a good position, even a technical or professional position, with a baccalaureate degree. Now similar opportunities require either a master's or a Ph.D. Thus we are finding that at the same time that we must provide more eduation for more and more undergraduates, we are also faced with perhaps increasing demands for the education of people beyond the bachelor's degree.

This advanced work goes beyond the master's level, even past the Ph.D. level, and also includes the several professions. What community isn't talking about the need for more doctors, more dentists, more pharmacists, more nurses, and more engineers to take their place in society? And where are these educated? They are educated in great part in our complex public universities.

Thusly, for its mission in advanced work, we have the problems of the institutions having to gear up not only for undergraduates but at the same time for the higher level of work which requires more professors per student and is a more expensive part of our education. This indeed becomes a special problem for legislators in providing educational support. It is at this point that tension can enter between the two missions of the complex state universities; one the mission for undergraduate education, the other for graduate education. Often the policies that make the most sense for facilitating education of undergraduates do not make the best sense for development of strength in graduate school. Schools find themselves compromising within the institution itself, in attempting to reconcile undergraduate development with provision for the strongest impetus to graduate programs. The same policies don't necessarily work for both.

For example, the intellectual leader who attracts and nurtures a few brilliant and devoted graduate students is often expensive, requires expensive and esoteric equipment and is sometimes beyond the mundane level of comprehension of the hordes of undergraduates sampling the fundamentals of his discipline. On the other hand, the prototype of the undergraduate's professor, expensive, patient, responsive to adolescent interests, may not have the hours or the inclination for the rarified unknown heights of his discipline. Though this contrast oversimplifies the situation, universities do have to choose at times between emphasis on serving undergradtate or graduate curricula, in terms of facilities, resources, and recruitment. Legislators, too, are involved in the issues of these choices.

THE RESEARCH MISSION

The third mission of the modern complex university relates to the second mission of advanced study. This is the educational mission of research.

Certainly our land-grant institutions at their founding felt a great obligation to the agricultural endeavor of the rural part of the society. Thus the mission of modern research is not new to the origins of many of the institutions represented here, though its expanse and implications have vastly broadened. We easily recognize that over the last century the research that has been done in agriculture in our land-grant institutions and the resulting extension service that has linked the institution with rural society through farm agents and home demonstration agents, has probably been one of the greatest factors in making the agriculture base of this country as strong as it is.

The importance of this can probably not be over-emphasized. If one were to argue as to whether or not this country or the USSR is ahead in the technology of space, one could get a real argument. But if one were to argue about agriculture, there is no question as to which country has the stronger base. In fact, authorities tell us that the recent change of government in Russia resulted in great part from the failure of former leaders to meet basic agricultural needs. Indeed, what this country has accomplished in the area of production influences the role that the United States must play as we deal with problems of population not only in this country but also in the world. In this regard, we are hearing less and less of overproduction. American agricultural research now deals not only with feeding the world but also with feeding that knowledge of agricultural sciences to the world so that it can feed itself.

Certainly the example of agricultural research strengthens the mission of research for the entire university endeavor. The university's mission of research indeed has been present since the beginning. Yet the familiar issue of asserted conflict between teaching and research is still heard, though research has always been a part of good scholarly endeavor. Individual faculty members, in order to be effective teachers, needed to be abreast of their field, and were often beckoned beyond the current limits. The search for truth and the new truth, so to speak, has always been a part of a university's mission.

However, on a broader scale significant changes have occurred in the research mission, becoming prominent during and following World War II. In that period the federal government became a big partner and certainly the greatest customer of university research, a necessity in the national interest. Our own national defense posture, our national weaponry, grew out of research, especially in the field of nuclear physics, that was basically a part of universities and colleges in this nation. Our space program and many of our programs relating to advancing health are now centered in university research, and universities now are looked upon to initiate and develop this research. In fact they are not looked upon, they are expected to.

And yet as this research mission becomes greater and greater in importance, other stresses develop in the several missions of the complex university in public education. When one begins to put this mission of research against the first mentioned mission of teaching undergraduates, a true tension can result, one with which persons in our legislatures are indeed familiar. The answer is not clear cut, and emotions become linked to expense of research but justifiable pride in national superiority, to sympathy for the less gifted undergraduate but appreciation for elements of prestige in good research. Educational administrators have needed to be alert and protective of the first mission of the institution to the undergraduate as it is affected by the research mission. I am sure there are cases where faculty members who were the most able teachers now have responded more to the third mission of research, sometimes in a sense of patriotic response to a national urgency requiring their services and yet sometimes for the subtle rewards and release some research can provide. This research mission does fit in many instances, of course, with the graduate program of the institution. In fact, the extent of research would be hampered without the assistance of graduate students. The advantage works both ways, however. Part of graduate education involves opportunities for students to do independent work and to have association with wise mentors in solving assignments. Within the research mission itself the issue is sometimes drawn between pure research and the purpose-oriented research aimed directly toward practical problems. The latter type often attracts the grant monies and subsidies.

Most universities feel that all three of these missions--for the undergraduate, the graduate, for research--are very definitely a part of the total educational responsibility of a public institution in higher education. This has meant that institutions must develop faculties and programs which will meet these responsibilities and here indeed is an area of stress. The development of research and research institutes has required complicated, large, expensive facilities and big equipment pieces often used by few and selected personnel. All this has changed our universities perceptively. When one visits the campus as a citizen and taxpayer one often is struck by these elaborate facilities as contrasted to what used to be the single purpose facilities of our pristine undergraduate days.

Within an institution one talks about loyalty to the purpose of the university. And yet where does this loyalty come to focus? I would say there are many loyalties within an institution now and not the single ones we used to think of. This becomes true for all of us educators and representatives of the people, the legislators.

THE SERVICE MISSION

Now we turn to the fourth mission of our institutions, the mission mentioned as one of the original ones for many of us—the public university's obligation for service. This mission is true of private universities, too, but it is particularly incumbent upon a state university.

Certainly in a legislative workshop we readily recognize that a university, a public institution, is indeed an instrument of and for the people. The people of the state in their role as the providers of this support, can in many ways be looked upon as the stockholders of the institution. Educational administrators must continue to be aware of the responsiveness of this state university in its relationship to its constituents, and recognize that in some part the trustees are representatives of the "stockholder", that is, the people of the state. An institution of a public nature therefore must be both leader and servant of society.

Here too, this fourth mission of the modern university can produce diffenences of policies and missions within an institution as seen through certain eyes. I've mentioned the agricultutal service that followed the agricultural research almost from the beginnings of many of our public universities, and this service continues today. We see ahead of us the problems of feeding more and more people in this world and realize that as fewer and fewer people are engaged in agriculture, working on less and less land, the means by which this is accomplished must be more sophisticated and must be based on even deeper and more basic research. In turn, there must be continually a wider extension of the information gained. I speak with a particularly strong emphasis because this is the area of my own academic commitment and discipline.

However, all of us know that our society is shifted now from a rural dominance to an urban majority. The universities are being called upon, and rightfully so, by other segments of society for the same kinds of research and service that have been traditionally helpful in agriculture. Extension research programs are developing in these areas of inquiry on many of our campuses, as a facet of the mission of service to society. At the University of Kentucky we are expanding our extension services to include all areas and facets of our Commonwealth, making available the special and expert training of persons in all fields of interest, not just in agriculture. Research questions are now posed in the problems of water resources, the problems of air possution, the programs of understanding people and their relationships.

The statement has been made by many that the problems of the next thirty years are going to be "people problems". Helping people to understand how to live closer and closer together as they have chosen to do in the metropolitan areas, a pattern which has intensified social problems that have always existed but now are much more intense, must play a central role in a university's service. It is in this context that campuses have developed the institutes of social change, of developmental change, new concepts to many of our constituents but just as important to our society as a newly developed hybrid corn.

In the areas of social dynamics, the scientist needs, as always, first to understand the problems and principles and secondly to be able to work with society in the application of the principles for the solution of problems. It's very easy for many people to walk up to one of the social problems of our time and say "education is the only answer", and then walk away from it, leaving those of us in education to translate this assignment into some kind of meaningful action. Here, particularly, we need the support and understanding of legislators in this newer field of service.

In being responsive to the demand from all parts of society, hardly a day or week goes by that a state university president is not asked by a federal department, or federal regional agency, or a state agency, or a local or county or multi-county agency, to provide the time of a particular professor or a group of professors to help show the way, to plan a course of action, even to lead a course of action in an area of inquiry useful to a segment of society. Desirable as these assignments are, one can readily see how this mission, the mission of service, could disrupt and conflict with other missions of the complex public university—a mission of research, the mission of pure research, the mission of graduate education and the mission of handling great numbers.

We now see with a new perspective this complex public university, different from the campus many of us know and loved a few decades ago. Though we might have feelings of loving nostalgia for those days, we know we cannot turn back and indeed the future beckons us on with great promise. We find our great new universities involved responsibly and creatively in every facet of human society, pointing the way, serving, improving. Our own University of Kentucky, in its service mission, finds itself running a big hospital, running a saw mill in Eastern Kentucky, helping plan a new motel in one of the deprived areas of Eastern Kentucky, devising a way to get some new industry there, assisting half way across the world in a newly emerging nation. Examples from your own schools can illustrate the broadened expansive role of universities in society today, and all of us must welcome it if indeed "education is the answer". When someone asks what is the mission of a complex state university, one no longer answers in one syllable or one phrase.

THE COLLISION OF MISSIONS

Now, having presented these missions of the complex university in modern society, let us deal with some of the issues which will already have come to your minds. How do we meet the responsibilities of all of these missions, all of them important, all of them having inherent problems, all of them at times abrasive to the fullest development of one another?

One question relative to each mission is the balance of quality and quantity. Some educational pessimists say that if you try for quality, you cannot accomplish in quantity. In regard to specific educational missions, some people warn, "Don't get too far into research because teaching and research tend to offset each other." There are now new voices in greater volume, "Don't get too far into service, because teaching and research are the basic mission." They imply that the service mission must take a second priorty in terms of the commitment of university facilities. Some even question the extent to which the complex state university should accept the service assignment for national and world benefit. Some say we cannot financially support these several missions within our state and national educational resources and therefore must give up some of our commitments. In a sense we have some people that are wringing their hands as they contemplate the complex public university today.

Some feel we should limit in admission the numbers of undergraduates. But I would point out that as we consider the apprehension engendered by the ever increasing number of undergraduates seeking university enrollment, we need to review one of the basic tenets of our society: it is the maximum enlightenment of our citizenry on which a democracy must be built. The fact that there are more and more capable young persons seeking a maximum educational opportunity is a cause for rejoicing. Certainly a solution to the many problems caused by burgeoning enrollment is not to cut back on the opportunity. We will have a potentially improved base for our democracy and for the strength of our nation.

STATEWIDE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

How shall we deal with these and other problems equally puzzling and peremptory for our educational obligation? In my judgment, the most important thing is to devise intensive and expansive planning at the statewide level, to determine how and where these various missions can best be accomplished.

Should some institutions assume primary responsibility for certain missions, and other institutions concentrate on other missions? Is this one solution for the stress and inherent conflict between missions? Does this save and conserve the resources which do have limitations of money and quality? In which of our colleges or universities can we best deal with the mission of numbers, at the same time preserving the quality of undergraduate education? How and where can we best meet the research mission without unproductive duplication of expensive equipment and expensive scientists? How best can we organize for the service aspect of the educational enterprise?

The last decade has seen some outstanding examples and results of such planning. Such planning and choices of emphasis have been done not only at the state level but also by individual institutions, including many private institutions who have had to make the assessment of their own missions. Some private colleges are considering whether to continue their focus on excellent programs or expand their mission in terms of the tempting federal opportunities for support of Ph.D. programs, the research programs and service projects. These private institutions are free to make up their minds as to what their mission is, of how they wish to commit and develop their resources.

This freedom in many instances serves almost as a lighthouse for those of us in public education who are concerned about quality, about integrity of purpose and integrity of mission. They often can and do serve as centers of innovations, evaluation, and conciliation. They and we are fortunate that they are free to make these choices.

On the other hand, a state institution does not have full choice, or a group or a state system, if you will, does not have this choice. Because of its charter from its constituency, a state system must provide educational opportunities at the various levels and include also the missions of research and service, with a planned instrumentation for effectiveness.

Legislators, as representatives of the people, perhaps readily recognize the immediacy of appeal in higher education to the need for undergraduate opportunity. This constituency is responsive to the matter of fees, to crowded conditions, to teacher load. A bit more removed, but of equal total importance, is the mission of graduate study, of research, of expansive service. Complex state universities are indeed asked to serve not only the state, but also the nation and the world. Graduate study and research do not know state lines; service missions have become national and international in character. The obligation falls to the state institution for regional and national needs in the training of graduate and professional people as well.

Although there can be differences within a state supported system, as to what the assigned role of a particular institution is going to be, nevertheless the total system has to accomplish all of these four missions within the state's resources and ability to support this, or else fail in the charge of public education in a democracy.

This is a sobering task but not an impossible one. For example, in

Kentucky we have faced the mission of undergraduate education and the accompanying complication of providing for great and ever increasing numbers. In our state, in terms of our special circumstances, the decision has been made to operate and nurture a system of community colleges in relationship to our complex state university. Our basic assumption is the complex state university can foster and nurture these community colleges and through local advisory boards can relate to community needs in the entire state. In the last four years these have grown from four rather small undergraduate centers to fourteen full comprehensive community colleges which within two years will be enrolling close to 10,000 students. This is cheaper but not a makeshift education for these undergraduates, many of whom could never have had the educational opportunity otherwise. After the freshman and sophomore year, many of them are at the larger state institutions, which have been somewhat relieved of the heavy first and second year enrollments. These institutions can now concentrate a little more on the upper division and on the graduate program.

Other examples of planning include programs of consortia among four year institutions and graduate institutions in many parts of our country, closely cooperating in planning, supporting, and utilizing joint facilities and curricula, or in consolidating programs of research and service. In this way, the total system provides for specialized needs without handicapping the missions of individual institutions. We are learning that cooperation and coordination have more widespread benefit than rivalry and attempts for each institution to provide for all needs.

AREA CONCENTRATION

We in public higher education need to think of the total system in terms of planning physical facilities best, use of financial resources, providing academic variety and excellence. There appear to be evolving three kinds of public institutions of higher education, each with special and important emphases of mission, and each with excellence as a part of its core intent.

One grouping includes the community colleges (or junior colleges or extended campuses) which even now in our nation are enrolling about 25 per cent of the freshmen and sophomores that are in public higher education. In ten years it is estimated this enrollment will be 75 per cent of those in the first two years of college, a tremendously significant help with the numbers involved in the undergraduate mission of education.

A second regional group is developing from what were once the more single purpose state normal schools or teachers colleges. In many states these institutions have greatly increased undergraduate admissions and become first state colleges and now regional universities. These institutions are continuing to play a major role in teacher education, but are also broadening out into liberal arts education, are handling programs at the master's level, again with great emphasis on the teacher training but also in other areas such as business and the arts.

Both of these groupings, the community colleges and the four-year regional universities, allow the third segment of the educational plan, the large complex state university, freedom to concentrate more on the missions still remaining to be provided for, and without costly duplication of effort and expenditure. The complex state university, enabled to grow a little less rapidly, to concentrate a bit more on the programs of the upper division of the university, of the specialized graduate programs, of the doctoral programs, of the professorial programs, will benefit the total endeavor in higher education. The entire system can gain in excellence and effectiveness and the individual units can gain in strength and productivity as they concentrate with clarity of purpose.

All three types of these institutions at their various levels of influence in their community and their region and their state are now providing programs of service in various levels to the people of the state, but the missions of undergraduate education, advanced work, and research can be improved by consolidation and concentration. The several missions of education in our modern world can be met successfully, but we must recognize that there are relatively few institutions which can meet all these missions equally well. There is a need for a coordinating mechanism which will deal with all the varied missions of public higher education to determine how each state can best meet its needs and obligations. Whatever design a state university evolves to accomplish these missions, central to each plan must be excellence and freedom to follow truth where it leads.

THE MISSION OF VERITY

In all this complexity we must be ever mindful of the classic tradition of unique university endeavor, a duty sometimes overshadowed by service demands, by confomity certification, by education by the numbers. This is the pursuit and the search for truth. A university, even a complex public one deeply involved in society, must never lose sight of its transcendent position, its obligation to search out truth, to keep the way open for truth.

This is a difficult issue in a public university but must be faced by legislators, as representatives of the people, and by educators dedicated to the inquiry of truth. A university has no prior position on good and bad. In this way a university can have a variety of seemingly conflicting projects and attitudes. As the university becomes involved, it becomes involved on all sides of all issues. It is not a tool of a particular position or attitude. For example, there can be people on the one hand that are studying the problems of effective use of insecticides to meet agricultural problems, and nearby in the same institution you can have people working on the problems of water pollution resulting from the use of insecticides as they are spread out into the water. The dual investigation must go on fully in a university in order for the ultimate truth, if it exists, to evolve into recognition.

A university must have freedom of action within its several missions so that the determinations it makes, whether it be as to whether or not a particular insecticide is the best one or whether or not a particular problem is met in a particular way, stands or falls on the basis of true inquiry. Society itself, while it may benefit from or disagree with the discovery, must not corrupt this function of the university in its transcendent role in our society, in its dangerous but necessary freedom. Paul Tillich has said, "When the way to truth is blocked, truth is dead."

Some persons assert that the more a university gets involved in society, the less it's going to be able to maintain its necessary aloofness, its judicial, unbiased role. The university must be in a sense a place of apartness from society so that it can be the critic, the evaluator, the constant, while other things change in society. Can the professor called into participation in public life maintain, like the Oxford don, its role of evaluator, of critic of society, if it is to criticize its own activities? It does indeed make the preservation of this position somewhat more difficult.

On the other hand, other people say that the more the university does become involved in society, the more people will understand the nature of the university, both for its missions and for its unhampered quest for truth. This broader base of support will reinforce recognition of the university's absolute necessity in preserving detachment while it is providing specific service, continuous education and impartial research.

CONCLUSION

In this paper I have attempted to be specific and practical about the four missions of public higher education, of methods of dealing effectively with these missions and the inherent stresses they arouse. I have then stressed the fundamental requirement in scholarly endeavor for unhampered pursuit of truth. It has seemed to me to be worthwhile to present these views and convictions to this particular group, remembering a statement of President Kennedy to a group of educators:

> "Things don't happen. They are made to happen. And in the field of education they are made to happen by you and your members."

We as educators in the public realm, in concert with you, who are the spokesmen of the people, have ahead of us momentous decisions. Cicero said, "What greater or better gift can we offer the republic than to teach and instruct our youth?"

THE STATE PLANNING AND COORDINATING AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

by
Robert O. Berdahl, Director

When one is confronted with the numerous and inevitable problems posed by the planning and coordination of higher education, one is tempted to conclude that the process is by nature incapable of equilibrium. But few important activities are carried on in an atmosphere of sweetness and light. If Churchill's defense of the democratic process is valid—that it was the worst system of government except any other that has ever been tried—then, perhaps, it is not too negative to urge that the tensions and disagreements besetting the coordinating process are a lesser evil than either a return to the political jungle in higher education, where only the strongest prosper, or a move toward direct state administration, which would reduce higher education to mediocrity and uniformity.

The range of types, structures and functions of the state planning and coordinating agency is vast, with some state adding new variations practically every month. The following is an over-simplified set of generalizations, based largely on several recent studies and supplemented with the latest information received by our office.

TYPES OF AGENCIES

For the purpose of our study we have divided the states into five categories:

(a) states with neither formal nor voluntary coordination
(b) states with voluntary coordination undertaken by the institutions
(c) consolidated statewide governing boards, with no institutional sub-boards
(d) coordinating boards, with other institutional boards
(e) State Board of Education responsibility

Table I on the next page indicates the present classification of the various states and additional information about their agencies.

Emogene Pliner, Coordination and Planning, Louisiana Higher Education: 3 (Baton Rouge, La.): Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc., 1966).

J.G. Paltridge, "Organizational Forms Which Characterize Statewide Coordination of Public Higher Education" (unpublished ms., Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, n.d.).

S.V. Martorana and E.V. Hollis, State Boards Responsible for Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Circular No. 619 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962).

Dr. Berdahl is a professor of government at San Francisco State College. At the time of this work conference he was Director, Study of Statewide Systems of Higher Education for the American Council on Education.

TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATION OF STATES BY TYPE OF HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATION

TYPE and STATE	No. of Public Institutions Sr.	Jr.	Year Board Created	No. of Professional Staff[a]
CONSOLIDATED STATEWIDE GOVERNING BOARD				
Alaska	1	6	1935	b
Arizona	3	-	1945	9
Florida	5	24[c]	1905	16
Georgia	12	12	1931	9
Idaho	4	2	1912	d
Iowa	3	16	1909	3
Kansas	7	16[c]	1913	2
Mississippi	8	17[c]	1910	7
Montana	6	-	1889	3
Nevada	2	-	1864	1
North Dakota	6	6	1911	3
Oregon	7	8[c]	1929	30
Rhode Island	2	1	1939	2
South Dakota	7	-	1897	2
COORDINATING BOARD				
Arkansas[e]	8	3	1961	5
California	26	75	1960	17
Colorado[e]	10	9[c]	1965	3
Connecticut	5	11	1965	2
Illinois	12	27	1961	9
Kentucky[f]	6	9	1934	3
Maryland[e]	7	12	1963	3
Massachusetts	15	11	1965	d
Minnesota	9	14	1966	2
Missouri	10	9	1963	3
New Hampshire	3	3	1963	d
New Jersey	8	1	1967	g
New Mexico[e]	6	7	1951	3
North Carolina	16	13[c]	1955	5
Ohio[e]	10	36	1963	7
Oklahoma[e]	11	7	1941	6
South Carolina	5	7	1962	g
Tennessee[e]	7	-	1967	g
Texas[e]	22	34	1955	20

TABLE 1

(Continued)

TYPE and STATE	No. of Public Institutions		Year Board Created	No. of Professional Staff[a]
	Sr.	Jr.		
COORDINATING BOARD (Continued)				
Utah	4	3	1959	4
Virginia[e]	12	12	1956	6
Wisconsin	10	23[c]	1955	6
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION				
Michigan	11	20	1964	10
New York	25	34	1784	[d]
Pennsylvania	15	4	1963	[d]
VOLUNTARY				
Indiana	4	10	1951	
Nebraska	6	4	1966	
Washington	5	14	1961	
NO BOARD				
Alabama	10	1		
Delaware	2	-		
Hawaii	1	-		
Louisiana	10	-		
Maine	7	-		
Vermont	4	1		
West Virginia	10	1		
Wyoming	1	5		

---

[a] excludes secretarial and clerical staff.
[b] staff provided by the University of Alaska.
[c] junior institutions not included in coordinaring agency jurisdiction.
[d] information not available.
[e] all-public board—persons chosen to represent the public rather than the institutions. Some institutions have trustees elected by the public and would claim "public" status for them as well. But in this report we shall use the word in the former sense.
[f] institutional members non-voting.
[g] boards too new for data to be available.

The preceding table reported on the present status of coordinating agencies in the states, but it did not indicate the trends. According to Miss Pliner, the history of higher education for coordinating purposes can be divided into four periods: (1) complete autonomy of institutions that lasted from colonial days to the late 19th century; (2) creation of single statewide governing boards that began in the late 19th century and extended into the 1940's; (3) creation of informal voluntary arrangements that gained impetus in the decades of the forties and fifties; and (4) creation of formal statewide coordinating agencies concerned with research, policy and planning that began primarily in the 1950's and is continuing today.[2]

The pressures of expanding higher education caused some states to create formal structures for statewide coordination. Fourteen states established variations of the consolidated statewide governing board between 1864 and 1945. Since this type of board enjoys control over the internal administration of each institution, it obviously has adequate powers to handle overall coordinating policies. In fact, proponents of this system claim that only when powers of coordination and governance are thus combined can there be effective planning and coordination.

On the other hand, critics claim that consolidation leads to overcentralization and they question whether such a board can successfully administer more than a modest number of institutions. They also contend that its primary attentions usually go to administrative problems rather than to those of statewide planning and coordination which should have top priorty.

Defenders (and this usually includes those working under these systems) point out that no state that has adopted the consolidated governing board has ever abandoned it, in contrast to the rather hectic history of states with coordinating boards. Critics reply that no additional states have adopted this type since 1945, but this may reflect more the powers of the institutional boards which would be superseded by the consolidated board, than it does any objection in principle to the idea of consolidation.

The phenomenon of voluntary coordination had its strongest expression in states where the college and university presidents and boards feared over-centralization. They took the initiative themselves to create on-going organs for collaboration to prevent formal state actions. These varied all the way from very casual meetings and agreements to the rather special arrangements which were created in Arkansas, California, Colorado, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Washington. Of these only Indiana and Washington remain in the voluntary category, and many academics still insist that this form alone permits the institutional autonomy necessary to educational excellence.[3]

---

[2] Pliner, op cit, p. 12.

[3] H. M. Chambers has written the major work elaborating on this point of view, Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1961.

Disadvantages of the voluntary system hinge on the fact that it usually requires unanimity among the participating institutions and this tends to keep the system in lock-step. Rarely does such a group recruit an independent director of some stature, give him adequate research staff and ask for complex long-range planning which will involve decisions painful to some of the members.

Perhaps because of the alleged shortcomings of the voluntary system as practiced in most states, or because of the increasing pressures on state governments to rationalize public policy decisions in the face of severely limited resources, there has been a steady move in the last twenty years to create formal coordinating bodies.

The advantages of using this type of coordinating board have been described by Lyman Glenny, an early scholar in the field and presently director of the Illinois Board, "...the ease of establishment by state legislation, ...their desirability in the eyes of the institutions when compared to a single governing board, and...the improvement in quality of professional staffs...Existing institutions and governing boards continue to operate. The coordinating board attempts to provide order and planning either by regulating directly certain phases of operations such as programs and budgets, or by advising the governing boards, legislature and governor of desirable course of action, or by both means."[4]

A long series of attacks on these boards from the academicians as well as the state governments indicates that they are no panacea for the problems of higher education. Since they are "neither fish nor fowl," that is, neither directly identified with and supported by the universities and colleges nor the organs of state government, these bodies tend to operate in a no-mans'-land where their responsibilities often exceed their powers. It is not surprising, then, to find that bills to cut back their powers or to abolish them are introduced from time to time in some legislatures.

Nevertheless, the need to strive for equitable statewide coordination and planning continues and the states perforce experiment. Tennessee and New Jersey have just created new coordinating bodies; South Carolina has revived an old one and Louisiana is debating whether to do the same; and Maine and West Virginia have been giving considerable attention to the question of establishing one for the first time.

Another variation on the coordinating board scheme is found in New York, Pennsylvania and Michigan where the state boards of education have jurisdiction over the coordination of higher education.

---

[4] Lyman Glenny, "State Systems and Plans," Emerging Patterns in Higher Education, ed. Logan Wilson (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965), p. 91. See also his major work analyzing coordination, Autonomy of Public Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

In New York the larger part of this task is handled within the giant State University of New York by its own governing board; but in Pennsylvania and Michigan, the state boards have no large sub-systems and therefore retain the major responsibility for statewide coordination and planning. This has the obvious advantage of integrating the planning for all education into one supposedly coherent package. But there are many in the field of higher education who would be unhappy at having their affairs lumped together with those of public education, arguing that the problems involved in the two sectors are different in kind and not just in degree.

BOARD JURISDICTION

In most states board jurisdiction extends to all public colleges and universities, but two year colleges are excluded in a few states in both the governing (Florida, Kansas, Mississippi and Oregon) and the coordinating (Colorado, North Carolina and Wisconsin) categories.

Private institutions are under board authority in New York and Missouri, and to some extent in New Hampshire. Elsewhere private institutions are usually included in state long-range planning, a trend geven further encouragement by the inclusion of the private sector in the provisions of the federal Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. In fifteen of the states (2 consolidated statewide boards, 11 coordinating boards and 2 boards of education) the existing statewide bodies have been designated the agencies to administer the federal facilities funds. In other states, special agencies have been created, but these often maintain close links with the statewide coordinating body.

In the three states (New York, Pennsylvania and Michigan) where the ultimate responsibility for coordinating higher education has been placed in the state boards of education, the latter have jurisdiction over primary and secondary education as well.

BOARD COMPOSITION

Boards range in size from seven to eighteen members, with nine being the most popular number. Governing boards tend to be smaller and coordinating boards somewhat larger, probably because the latter often include representatives from a variety of educational institutions from within the state. The terms of office range from one to fifteen years, with six and four years the most common. In every case except those of ex officio members, the terms are staggered to foster some continuity of experience.

The Governor is the appointing officer of at least a majority of the board members, usually with Senate consent. The exceptions are New York, where the Board of Regents is elected by the legislature on a joint ballot; Nevada and Michigan, where the statewide boards are elected by the people; and California and Minnesota, where sizeable delegations sit as institutional representatives on their boards without gubernatorial appointment.

In addition to the obvious limitations resulting from staggered terms the powers of Governors to make appointments are limited in ten states by requirements that some or all board members come from different areas of the state, usually congressional or judicial districts. Four states provide that the board must be bi-partisan. Only Ohio forbids reappointment.

With the exception of two alumni representatives on the Rhode Island Board of Trustees, and six ex officio memberships of Governors, Superintendents of Education and an Attorney General on the boards of Arizona, Montana and Rhode Island, all members of consolidated governing boards are lay persons representing the general public. In sharp contrast to this, only nine of the twenty-two coordinating boards are composed entirely of persons representing the general public (Arkansas, Colorado, Maryland, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas, Virginia, and the newly created board in Tennessee). The three state boards of education with responsibilities to coordinate higher education are also structured in this fashion.

Thirteen coordinating boards, then, have some members who are selected as representatives of the institutions within their state. In the cases of California, New Hampshire and Minnesota a majority of the membership is thus drawn from institutions, but in all other states such members constitute a minority (Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Utah and Wisconsin). The institutional representatives are normally drawn from the various governing boards, but California, New Hampshire, Minnesota and Missouri have presidents as well. Kentucky, which formerly had a majority of institutional representatives, now includes six college and university presidents as non-voting members. Wisconsin and Maryland also had boards with institutional representatives in the majority, but Maryland in 1963 converted to an all-lay board and Wisconsin in 1964 altered its membership so that the institutional representatives became a minority. California in 1966 added three more "public" members to the three already on the board.

BOARD ORGANIZATION

Although bi-monthly meetings are called in Colorado, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina and Wisconsin, and quarterly meetings in Arkansas, Kentucky, New Mexico and Texas, the workload is often so heavy that most boards meet monthly. The better prepared boards have agendas and position papers circulated well in advance of their meetings. Several states have "open-meeting" laws which supposedly preclude confidential caucusing on controversial issues, but one imagines that there are several ways in addition to the obvious telephone by which boards can avoid washing their dirty linen in public.

Boards choose their own officers except in Illinois, South Carolina and Texas where the Governor selects the chairman, and in Montana where the Governor himself acts as chairman. Nearly all boards use standing committees for the expeditious and careful treatment of their business, but the practice is somewhat more common in consolidated governing boards than in coordinating boards. While there is a danger that a board may defer too readily to a

2

powerful individual or committee and not scrutinize recommendations carefully enough, there is also the opposite danger that a failure to create specialized talents among the busy board members by the use of standing committees may result in disproportionate power going either to an executive committee or to the professional staff. This latter risk is strongest when the board has no institutional representatives on it and the lay members are heavily dependent on the professional staff for acquiring the "feel" of complex academic issues. This problem of educating a completely lay board to the intricacies of academic issues to some extent met in many states by the operation of a Council of Presidents acting in an advisory capacity to the board. We found this group to vary markedly in its effectiveness from state to state, sometimes meeting with well prepared agendas and other times hardly meeting at all.

PROFESSIONAL STAFFING

The importance of acquiring an outstanding director and a highly qualified professional staff has been stated nearly ad nauseam; and yet a survey of these boards today reveals that this remains their key problem. It is partly a question of money and partly a matter of bringing together individuals with a unique combination of qualities.

A director and staff are needed who will bring to their research a detailed knowledge of practices and problems in both higher education and state government. Increasingly these boards will be judged on their ability to plan the state's limited resources in such a way as to maximize both quality and quantity of higher education. This will require extensive data collection and analysis in such areas as budgeting, cost analysis, space utilization, enrollment projections and program approval.

Budget data for the operation of these boards is not available in a form which will permit a comparative analysis of their staffing arrangements, but the numbers involved range from a total reliance on institutional staff in Alaska to a large consolidated operation in Oregon which required nearly 30 professional positions and a budget of over a million dollars in 1966.

Coordinating boards tend to have less staff for the number of institutions under their jurisdictions than do consolidated boards because they do not have governing responsibilities. But when they are designated as the state agency to administer some or all of the federal programs aiding higher education, their operating budgets and their professional staff both rise accordingly. In fact, I have heard it speculated that federal programs may ultimately come to subsidize up to 50 per cent of the planning and staffing expenses of many statewide boards.

In the three states where the state boards of education have responsibility for the coordination of higher education, the staffs operate as part of the state department of education, but in Michigan and Pennsylvania they are specifically designated as staff for higher education. In New York no such distinctions are drawn, except that the State University of New York undertakes the lion's share of coordinating within its own giant system.

BOARD POWERS

After 13 months of dealing with many state boards around the country, I am convinced that their powers cannot be set forth in a neat classification scheme. One legal analysis will indicate that several boards lack certain powers, e.g. to master plan; but a close reading of the enabling legislation reveals ample power for this purpose, even though it is not couched in the explicit language of master planning. In other states, e.g. Wisconsin, we know that boards have not always exercised to the fullest the powers that are explicitly given them. It is obvious, then, that all generalizations based on secondary sources are risky in this area. Having said that, I will attempt to make some tentative ones, based mainly on these secondary sources plus visits to approximately eleven states.

First, it is safe to say, as noted earlier, that consolidated statewide boards have by definition the most powers, for they literally govern the institutions under their jurisdiction as well as coordinate them. With no institutional sub-boards to "fight back," the governing board is free to exercise its sovereign judgment in matters of planning, budget, programs, capital expansion, and so forth. If simplicity and rigor were the only criteria for judging the effectiveness of coordinating boards, the consolidated governing variety would win hands down.

The next most powerful agencies tend (with some exceptions) to be the coordinating boards composed totally, or in greater part, of public members. Boards such as those in Connecticut, Illinois, Ohio and Oklahoma seem to have the most substantial powers in budgeting and program approval. The Texas and Colorado boards are strong in program review but somewhat weaker in fiscal analysis, while the New Mexico board has strong fiscal powers but has less authority in the area of program review. Utah's board has fairly extensive powers, but mostly of a recommending nature; the fact that its advice is so often followed is a sign of high quality staff research.

It is too early to judge the relative strengths of the Massachusetts, New Jersey, Tennessee and South Carolina boards. On paper the first three could develop into relatively powerful agencies.

As might be expected, those coordinating boards where institutional members play a stronger role tend to be more advisory in nature and less given to regulatory powers. This could mean either that they are more sensitive than other boards to the vital need to give maximum autonomy to the institutions, or it could mean that the institutional members use their influence on the coordinating boards to protect the vested interests of their home institutions. I have personally seen evidence to support both interpretations. In any case, boards such as the former institution-dominated ones in Kentucky and Maryland and the present ones in California, Minnesota and New Hampshire are those with the least powers in budget and program review. While the earlier Wisconsin board with an institutional majority had considerable powers in these areas, it did not choose to exercise them. A reorganization of the board in 1964 brought a public majority and an independent staff for the first time, and it remains to be seen what effect the change will have.

The three state boards of education with higher education responsibility seem to be exercising very light authority at this stage in their operations. In New York we know that the State University's extensive internal coordination is a major explanation; in Michigan and Pennsylvania we assume that their relatively recent date of change - 1963 - may be at least a partial explanation.

The function of planning which was so badly neglected by most governing and coordinating boards ten years ago has now become in many cases the primary concern. A review of recent planning shows studies of greater or lesser breadth in the following states: Arizona, Alaska, California, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah and Virginia. In addition, the boards in Maryland, North Carolina and Texas are currently engaged in producing a state master plan. (Incidentally, this list may be incomplete: as an example, recent plans in New Jersey, Washington and West Virginia which were not the products of state-wide coordinating boards have been omitted.)

Lyman Glenny distinguishes between state surveys and true master plans by setting up these criteria for jedging the latter:

> ...the variety of subjects studied; the volume of data collected; the depth of analyses; the integration of programs, budgets, and building priorities to provide a unity of purpose; the full inclusion of the nonpublic institutions and the means for step-by-step implementation of the plan, with simultaneous review and revision leading to fulfillment of major goals.[5]

Once agreement is hammered out on the basic goals for a state's system of higher education, then an estimate can be made as to the gap between a state's resources and its educational needs. If the gap is large, either the resources must be increased or the needs must be scaled down. Usually, of course, it is the latter which is required. This is an enterprise of the utmost delicacy and calls for the fullest cooperation of all parties concerned. Someone must usually be disappointed and it is important that the negative decisions be based on the maximum public interest of the state, and not on the relative political muscle of the various interested parties.

Sometimes this involves decisions to allow none or only a selected few of the two year institutions to become four year; sometimes it means that none or only a selected few of the former teachers' colleges can be allowed to become universities; sometimes it means that some areas of the state get new institutions and others do not; all these and other decisions involve painful choices and it is well to try and make them together in one coherent package rather than to fight them out in strident ad hoc battles. The obvious weakness in this Utopian theory of master planning is that such plans require frequent revision and old wounds are easily re-opened in the process.

---

[5] Lyman Glenny, "State Systems and Plans," p. 96.

Once such basic decisions have been made, it is possible for the coordinating agency to exercise its budget and program review powers, and its capital outlay analysis, as means of administrative implementation of the master plan goals. In budgeting, the use of formulas and cost analysis constitute the current trend, with program-planning-budgeting systems talked of in some states as the wave of the future. Formulas, in my experience, have been more useful in achieving equitable division of state support within higher education, once the gross amount has been determined; but state legislatures that I have observed have been reluctant to surrender to the formula makers their power to make the basic decisions about overall state support.

Glenny has recently described developments in the use of formulas:

> Some formulae have now become very complex, with separate subformulae for academic staff, library, nonacademic personnel, physical plant maintenance, and administration. In addition, a sliding scale of weights is often used for budgeting the various levels of instruction, from freshman to doctorate levels. By considering a greater number of factors, the coordinating agencies attempt to make the formulae more objective, and hope to reflect the variety of programs and functions of the several institutions. Experience has shown that formulae must be constantly re-evaluated to keep them timely and equitable and to reflect as accurately as possible the changing assumptions which serve as their basis.[6]

Program review is also becoming a more sophisticated process in some state agencies. Faced with the need to avoid undue proliferation of high cost graduate programs, most state boards have created some procedures wherein critical judgments can be made. Some boards, like North Carolina's, rely heavily on outside experts brought in ad hoc to advise on the decision in question. The Illinois board, on the other hand, has a standing committee of outside experts representing diverse fields, which makes recommendations in such cases. Still other states, such as Ohio and Florida, have instituted rigorous internal screening procedures for new programs which require detailed justification of their need, analysis of the probable costs, evaluation of the readiness of the institution in question to undertake the proposed program, and so on. Councils of academic officers from the various institutions have learned to work together in making some of these delicate judgments, and the evidence indicates that after some initial mutual logrolling these committees are getting down to serious work. Of course, their deliberations are only advisory to their respective boards, but it will be an enormous improvement both in board workload and in the education of the institutions to a statewide perspective if the process can be made to work.

The two major developments in capital outlay analysis concern space utilization studies and the integrating of capital expansion with long-range program planning. Some states have long been effective in both these areas, but the federal Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 has provided impetus for more states to rationalize their building programs in higher education. Most recently, the federal government has provided a considerable sum of planning money for the next three years to enable states to relate their building priorities to estimates of program needs based on student and faculty projections.

---

[6] Ibid., p. 99.

Some boards have been assigned responsibility for administering other federal programs such as technical services, community service and continuing education; and as noted earlier, these additional activities are increasing both the budgets and the staff of some boards. Whether it will de facto cause some advisory boards to become regulatory boards remains to be seen.

MAJOR PROBLEMS AND ISSUES FACING STATE PLANNING AND COORDINATING AGENCIES

It is not difficult to describe the central dilemma of the state coordinating agencies, but it is nearly impossible to judge what the particular balance of forces in a given state should be in order to obtain the desired results. The central dilemma is how to create an agency that can operate between state government and higher education and earn the continuing confidence of both. On the one hand are the membership, powers and activities of the agency who must convince the Governor and the legislature that the public interest in higher education is being safeguarded against the possible excessive ambitions of the various institutions and the chaos of unplanned developments? On the other hand, do the universities and colleges feel that the board membership and staff really understand the complex problems of higher education and that they are exercising their coordinating responsibilities in such a way as to preserve the maximum institutional autonomy?

It has been my experience that most coordinating agencies fail to achieve this ideal balance of forces because they become identified either as an arm of state government or as a pressure group for higher education. Beyond the inevitable interplay of particular personalities, it is the nature of board membership, the board powers and the quality of board staff which determine what identification is the prevailing one. Listed below are some of the questions which habitually arise in these crucial areas.

The following issues have to be met in terms of coordinating board membership. Should at least a majority of the board be appointed with staggered terms by the Governor? With senate consent? Should there be some screening device comparable to the Bar Association vetting of judicial appointments? Should legislators sit on the board? What proportion, if any, should college and university presidents and/or trustees constitute of the board? If not full members, should presidents be non-voting members in order to provide professional advice? Or should they be established as a separate advisory council of presidents with a formal relationship to the board? Should private universities have some formal link with the board? The answers to these questions provide part of the reason why a particular board will or will not have the confidence of both state government and higher education.

The issue of board powers poses a complex set of questions relating to master planning, budget and program review, and capital outlay analysis. Should the coordinating agency be given the power to master plan, or should this be done by either outside consultants or in-state citizen groups? If master planning is undertaken by the agency, what kind of consultation occurs with the institutions of higher education within the state, both public and private? What kind of consultation occurs with other relevant departments of state government? Are educators and public officials both represented on advisory committees? If controversial decisions are made regarding role and scope allocations of institutions, or location of new institutions, or new governing structures, how ready is the legislature to back up these recommendations with appropriate statutes? What provisions are made for periodic review of master plan principles in order to recognize changing conditions and to render equity to institutions with demonstrated grievances? (Some critics have pointed out that completely rigid role and scope planning 30 years ago would have prevented many normal schools from becoming liberal arts colleges or universities.)

Should the coordinating agency have the power of detailed budget review, and sufficient funds to recruit the high powered staff necessary to undertake it? Or should the state concentrate its thorough review in either the Governor's office or the legislative appropriations committees? Is there a need for more than one layer of sophisticated analysis? If not, what is gained and what is lost by having such a review performed by the coordinating agency? Should the agency be given a lump sum appropriation for redistribution to the institutions of higher education? Are the institutions asked to supply too much data to too many state offices? What are the "hidden costs" of coordination?

Should agency approval be required for the commencement of new degree programs? Should this be especially essential in the case of high cost graduate programs? Or should the agency merely "advise" the institutions and the government of its judgment? What kind of review mechanism should be established, internal or external? Is it an infringement on intitutional autonomy to require agency approval of new degree programs or new branch campuses? Who should make the key determination on the location of new institutions - the agency, the Governor, or the legislature?

Should the coordinating agency have advisory or regulatory powers regarding the capital expansion program in higher education? Is the statewide job one of meshing the various institutional building programs into one consolidated list, or does it include the possibility of asking for a reordering of internal priorities within the institutions? Would the latter infringe on institutional powers of internal management?

The answers to these questions about board powers will obviously further affect the attitudes of state government people and academics about the coordinating process. If the agency is too weak to accomplish its assigned objectives, the persons in state government will not respect it nor rely on its advice; if it is so powerful that it will brook no institutional dissent, then the higher education community will lose their trust in it.

A third set of variables hinges on the quality and quantity of the agency staff. Has a staff been recruited with sufficient experience in both state government and higher education to understand the problems and perspectives of both? If the agency has been given heavy responsibilities in planning, budget review, and/or administration of federal programs, has the staff been enlarged adequately? What are the attitudes of persons in state government and higher education about the quality level of the staff, and particularly of its director? Of course, everyone speaks for high quality; but is the state prepared to depart from traditional personnel practices and pay scales to recruit persons who can negotiate with highly-paid, sophisticated university administrators on terms of relative equality? And do university and college presidents really want men of stature across the table in negotiations? Answers to these questions will also help to determine the degree of confidence which the agency earns from both state government and higher education.

ASSESSMENT OF FUTURE TRENDS

As we look beyond the existing relationships and problems to those which may be emerging in the future, we should take note of the possible impact on statewide coordination and planning of the following factors:

1. Enrollment projections, including possible universal higher education through the 14th grade.
2. Changes in state government:
    - (a) constitutional revision
    - (b) improved state planning agencies
    - (c) removal of one term limitation on Governors' offices
    - (d) program-planning-budgeting systems
    - (e) reapportionment
    - (f) annual sessions
    - (g) improved committee staffing and reference services
3. Impact of federal aid programs in higher education - including the possibility of some turn-back of federal monies to the states through a form of tax sharing.
4. Relations between state government and private higher education.
5. Impact of increased faculty and student militancy.

These variables are so many and so complex that it would obviously be impossible to anticipate with any accuracy their collective impact on coordinating and planning. But it is just as obvious to keep them in mind when making any assessment of the future course of coordination.

It is undoubtedly irritating for politicians and the public to be told over and over that higher education is a qualitatively different kind of operation from other state activities, but it just happens to be so. With roots that go back for hundreds of years, with a delicate inner operating rationale that differs markedly from that of government or industry, the university is literally a "golden goose" which can easily be killed by improper treatment. The state has every right to assure itself that the institutions within its jurisdiction are operating in the broad public interest, but it must be very careful in interpreting that interest to recognize the special needs of universities and colleges for freedom. It has been said that no one who does not love a university should be allowed to tamper with it. Let us hope that the coordinating and planning agencies, which have such vital roles to play, will always be noted both for their respect for the public interest and for their love of the institutions of higher education.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF STATES FOR PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by
Allan M. Cartter

Higher education has been one of the fastest growing sectors of American life during the last twenty years. A review of demographic characteristics of the nation indicates that there will be another ten years of rapidly expanding demand before we approach a new stability paralleling the inter-war years. In a period of outer stability organic or institutional entities have little opportunity for change and evolution; in a period of dynamic growth the whole character of a body or a system can be quickly altered. Sometimes these changes are consciously directed; frequently they occur by incremental steps in a more haphazard manner. I believe that higher education in many states is being revolutionized without adequate forethought and design, largely because annual decisions are frequently made without a clear view of their implications in the larger time span.

In this larger perspective I would like to present five theses which some of you may find rather surprising. They grow out of personal experience, studies of trends in higher education, and—if I may be permitted--my own crystal ball.

First, I believe that the old dichotomy between public and private higher education has outlived its usefulness, and that this archaic leftover from the nineteenth century will disappear before the end of the present century. I should add, anticipating my later comments, that I see little cause to weep over this trend if it is utilized in a manner which wisely preserves the essential values of diversity.

Second, I believe that some few states will make this transition in an orderly and carefully planned manner, but that many others will delay the marriage so long that both the bride and groom will have developed unwanted infirmities.

Third, I believe that many states are derelict in their duty to their citizens and extravagant in the use of public monies by omitting the independent colleges and universities from their master planning.

Fourth, I believe that the manner in which most states are centralizing the administration of public higher education is going to restrict the qualitative development of the public institutions and induce a pattern of conformity and mediocrity which will later have to be radically revised.

Dr. Cartter is Chancellor, New York University.

And, finally, I believe that the pricing philosophy followed by many state systems of higher education both limits the range of educational opportunities and at the same time is likely to destroy private higher education.

DICHOTOMY BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Let me return first to the point concerning the dichotomy between public and so-called private colleges and universities. I say "so-called" because those of us in the non-denominational independent institutions believe that we serve the public interest just as much as our colleagues in tax-supported institutions. For the typical professor, librarian, registrar, dean, president or, indeed, trustee, there is no difference whatsoever in their academic function and responsibility whether they serve a state college or a private liberal arts college. Each of these parts is interchangeable and I am sure that you know many examples of persons at each level who have moved from one type of institution to the other without difficulty. There is no difference in the curricula, the textbooks, the method of teaching, the degree requirements between New York and the State University of New York—between the University of North Carolina and Duke—between L.S.U. and Tulane. Each of these pairs of universities receives substantial support for research, facilities and educational programs from public funds at the national level, and in the eyes of the federal government the independent universities are just as accountable to the public as are the state universities. The only major difference between these institutions is in the manner of assuring continued financial support; the president and trustees in private institutions devote a portion of their time seeking out alumni and philanthropists, while their counterparts in tax supported institutions must make the rounds in the state capital.

There are, of course, on the fringe a number of denominationally controlled colleges which do not fit the previous description, but even here, it is striking to see the trend towards the secularization of collegiate education. The Catholic institutions, for example, traditionally the most subject to church control, are undergoing a revolutionary change today. Several have lay presidents, most of the major colleges and universities are instituting lay boards of control, and clerical faculty are a declining fraction of their professional staff. One can imagine that forty years from now many of these institutions will be no more church controlled than are, say, Duke, Vanderbilt or Emory today.

COST PRESSURES ON THE PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

You may wonder why I sound pessimistic about the future of private higher education at a time when the most distinguished private institutions appear to be flourishing. The reason is the result of a series of factors, most of which are in themselves praiseworthy—low tuition in public institutions, the upward cost pressures resulting from the rapid expansion of higher education, the determination of most states to develop high quality public colleges and universities, etc. These are not problems in themselves; but they pose major problems to the independent institutions to the extent that the state does not consider the continued welfare of all of its colleges and universities within its ken and care.

Let me illustrate briefly the nature of these problems and why I believe that their resolution rests on the shoulders of state governments. The rapid expansion of public higher education over the last ten of fifteen years--approximately 300,000 additional students are now accomodated each year in state colleges and universities, while the private sector is growing by only about 100,000 places a year—has contributed to an acute shortage of qualified faculty and other technical and professional personnel. For ten years average salary levels, which were admittedly low in the mid-1950's, have risen at approximately seven percent per year. Other costs for facilities, equipment and services have kept pace, for in the modern world the expanding frontiers of knowledge require more sophisticated educational tools ranging all the way from improved research libraries to nuclear accelerators. Endowment income and philanthropic giving continue to increase absolutely, but their purchasing power has declined over the last decade. This places the primary burden of rising costs on the student and parent in the form of higher tuition levels. When the private institutions were charging $1,000 a year, a $100 per year increase provided a ten percent increase (actually it was somewhat less, for every institution puts a significant fraction of such an increase back into scholarship aid). Today, however, when an institution such as my own has reached the level of $2,000 annually, a $100 annual increment represents only a five percent or less increase in revenue. One answer may be to begin adding $200 increments, but this alternative is effectively foreclosed by the pricing philosophy of state institutions.

If one adds together the major direct costs of attending a residential college, tuition, fees, board and room, and compares them for the average public and private institutions, a marked change is evident beginning in the late 1950's. For the preceding fifty years the ratio of total major costs between private and public colleges had remained surprisingly constant--at about 1.5 or 1.6 to 1. That is, it cost about 50-60 percent more to attend an independent college than to go to a state college or university. Over the last ten years, however, the price ratio has risen to more than 2.1. There has been no difference in the rate at which costs are rising for public and private institutions; the difference lies in the willingness of state legislatures to absorb a rising proportion of the cost of education in public institutions in the form of tax support, and the commitment in most states to a philosophy of merely token levels at state colleges and universities.

This is an admirable philosophy when there is only a single system of higher education; it is a disastrous philosophy when a sizeable fraction of higher education (nearly 50 percent today) is provided by an independent sector to which no tax support is given. If the present trend continues for another ten years, and the price ratio rises to 2.5 or 1 or greater, it is likely that only a handful of extremely well endowed private institutions will remain as viable quality institutions. The toll is already becoming evident in many states. Over the last decade the universities of Houston, Kansas City, Louisville, and several others have had to request absorption into their respective state systems. At a time when public systems of higher education are under great pressure to expand rapidly, such windfalls may be useful. By 1980, however, when the size of the college-age population will be relatively stable, many states will wish to look the other way.

INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS MUST SURVIVE

Absorption of independent institutions does indeed expand public systems, but one may question whether this represents a significant social gain. To take one illustration, the University of Buffalo in my state was an old and reputable independent university. However, it had a relatively small endowment ($17 million) and it encountered increasing difficulties in attempting to balance its budget. In 1962 it became a part of the State University of New York. Today, with about the same enrollment, it costs the state $45 million annually in operating subsidies, and it is about to build a new $400 million campus. Eventually it will be a stronger university, but one may reasonably speculate on whether it might have performed most of the same functions for the people of Western New York State if there had been some mechanism for the state to contribute several million dollars a year to its support, and whether this might have been a better social investment than shouldering a $45 million bill for its total cost.

The immediate response may be that children from underprivileged families would not have been able to afford to attend at the relatively high tuition levels Buffalo would have had to charge as a state-related independent institution. There is an interesting study completed last year by the California State Scholarship Commission which shows that the income distribution of parents of students at the University of California is indistinguishable from that of students attending the outstanding private colleges of the elite Claremont group, and the average parental income for Berkeley students was only about 15 percent lower than those at Stanford. Anyone who has driven through the student parking lots at Charlottesville, Chapel Hill, or Austin will quickly recognize that only a small fraction of students selected these distinguished universities because they could not afford an equivalent private university—and that that small fraction might have been even better provided for had higher tuition levels helped to support a more adequate scholarship budget.

The hottest political battle today in my state is over the appealing slogan of free tuition at public institutions. But how seldom do legislators see that free tuition is little aid to the student who is really deprived, and who not only cannot afford the transportation, food and book charges, but who also cannot forego the income which his family needs from him. Such a student may require as much as $2,000 a year over and above his tuition, and there are few public colleges with free or nominal tuition which can provide such aid. The average scholarship per student for the whole California higher education system is only four dollars; the bright but needy student in many states must select an independent college if he is to qualify for substantial financial aid.

Another aspect of this anachronism is that free access to a city college in New York City does not provide the good student in many fields with real opportunities. If a New York youngster is gifted in music, he should be able to attend Julliard or the Eastman School of Music. If he is gifted in mathematics, he should have access to the Courant Institute of Mathematical Science at New York University. If he is gifted in architecture, he should be able to attend Columbia or Pratt Institute. Free tuition at City College or Hunter does such a student little good. This situation has its parallel in most states, and it is the ghost of the public-private dichotomy that prevents the broadening of opportunities under public auspices and the presentation of real alternative choices to the student.

The situation is even more ironic because in the past one might have argued that it was less expensive to the state to send a young man or woman to a public college. In most states this has become a thing of the past, for public higher education is frequently as or more costly than that provided by the private institutions. The cost of education per student in the University of Illinois, for example, is nearly fifty percent higher than the tuition charged at Harvard, Yale, or Princeton. The operating cost per student in the four universities of the State University of New York is already nearly 30 percent above what it costs my university to provide equivalent education—and no part of the State University has yet achieved the quality we have attained. I believe the same comparisons could be made in your states with similar results. I should emphasize that this does not indicate that too much is being spent in public institutions for I believe the reverse is true; rather it indicates that public higher education is not a less expensive substitute for similar services obtained in non-tax supported institutions.

PLANNING SHOULD INCLUDE PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

What, then, would I recommend to your consideration in planning for the future development of higher education? First, I believe that the state must assume responsibility for planning the future growth of higher education within the context of all existing educational resources within the state. Fisk, Peabody, Southwestern, Sewanee and Vanderbilt are valuable resources to the State of Tennessee and the the southern region, and their welfare should be just as much a concern of the state government, in my view, as is the continued welfare of the University of Tennessee and Memphis State. The fact that independent institutions do not now cost the taxpayers of the state anything should be a stronger reason for their claim on your interest and attention, not a weaker one. The development of new institutions and new educational programs should be reviewed not only in the light of their impact on public institutions, but their likely consequences for the independent colleges and universities. To the extent that new or expanding public institutions weaken the independent sector, you are indirectly placing a larger eventual burden on the taxpayer. Every Pittsburgh, Houston or Buffalo you create will in all probability cost the state much more than the modest care and feeding required to keep the independent institutions strong.

Second, I believe that when the educational demands and manpower needs of the state dictate an expansion of educational facilities and services, the state should seriously explore the merits of alternatives encompassing all available resources within the state. Let me cite one recent example from my own state, where the need for expanded medical training has become apparent. The state has created two new medical schools, and absorbed two formerly private ones into the state system. However, these facilities were judged inadequate to meet future demands. Faced with the alternative of beginning another new college of medicine, which would take perhaps five years to become operational, nearly ten years to begin granting degrees, and perhaps twenty years to become well established, the state offered to subsidize expansion at eight existing private institutions. This September each of these schools will expand their entering classes, receiving $6,000 per additional student annually, plus some capital funds for facilities, and within four years a distinguished class of graduates will emerge. The cost to the state was less than the cost of new medical facilities of their own, and, in effect, this program created a new "instant medical school." In how many fields of critical manpower shortage could each state imaginatively utilize existing resources and capabilities if it were to address itself to the real social need, and not permit itself to be strait-jacketed by old dogmas concerning form?

Third, if my prophecies about the future financial plight of much of private higher education are true, as I firmly believe them to be, and if the problem has been created primarily by the prevailing pricing philosophy of public colleges and universities, then it follows that the states must shortly become involved in the preservation of independent educational institutions whether they want to or not. This is not a time in history when we can afford to let any moderately reputable institution disappear from the scene. Within a decade, I believe, you will have to seriously face the alternative of aiding independent colleges to survive or deciding to absorb them into the already sizeable public systems. In the interests of economy for the taxpayer, educational diversity for the potential student and relative institutional autonomy, I think that the wise choice will be the invention of new forms of public support for the independent colleges and universities.

To many of you who are concerned with public expenditure policy in your respective states, the thought of additional expenditures to support existing institutions may not be initially welcome. In the longer view, however, every independent institution that does not survive and which is either absorbed by the state or replaced by state facilities will cost the taxpayer ten to fifteen times as much as modest supplemental aid to insure its vitality. Retaining the independent character of such institutions will better enable them to continue to attract private gifts and grants from philanthropic foundations and federal agencies, thus helping state funds to have a significant multiplier effect.

In Pennsylvania today a number of independent universities receive approximately $300 per state resident student from state funds. In New York a current proposal suggests a cost-of-education subvention ranging from $250 for a freshman up to $1,000 for a Ph.D. student, on a graduated scale reflecting the relative cost of education at each level. With such aid many private institutions would be willing to absorb a larger share of the expected increases in enrollment, and some of the immediate pressures to further raise tuition levels would be mitigated.

Somewhat surprisingly there is greater concern today about the future of private higher education in Washington than in most state capitals. The White House has had several groups studying proposals, and the President's Science Advisory Committee is shortly bringing out a report on a proposed contingent loan scheme for student aid, tying future repayments to a student's income over a 30 or 40 year period. Alternative proposals for turning back federal tax revenues to the states (in a post-Vietnam world) would have a much greater chance of success, in the opinion of many, if some means of aiding all higher education in each state could be developed by the states themselves.

UTILIZE ALL EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

I would leave you, then, with the suggestion that each state might devote some of its planning energies to seeing how it could be utilize all available higher educational resources within its boundaries. I feel certain that most of you will be forced to do it within the next ten to fifteen years in any event, when faced with a private college and university sector of deteriorating financial vitality resulting from the widening price differential with heavily subsidized public institutions. Being forewarned is to be forearmed to do it in a planned and orderly fashion. We are no longer living in a world where the tax-supported collegiate systems are a small and weak partner of the well established private colleges and universities—the balance of numbers, financial resources and quality is rapidly tipping the other way. You still have a little time and room to devise a desirable mixed higher educational system which would meet the social goals of maximizing student freedom of choice, minimizing the cost to the public fisc, and providing the desired broad and diverse educational opportunities for your citizens. The Governor of New York has recently created a Select Committee on Private and Independent Higher Education, chaired by McGeorge Bundy, to review the state's responsibilities in this sphere; I would heartily recommend that this regional compact undertake a similar study of the future relationship of the many distinguished private colleges and universities in the South to their state governments. For a century or more your states have benefited greatly from the presence of strong private colleges and universities; it is in the long-run social, economic and cultural interests of your citizens that the state assume some responsibility for the continued health of these valuable public resources.

Panel Discussion

IMPACT OF FEDERAL ACTIVITY ON STATE ORGANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Moderator - Lanier Cox, Director of Studies in Higher Education
University of Texas

In this session of the conference we are concerned with the impact of federal activity on state organization of higher education. On the panel to discuss this subject are men who are personally engaged in the policy-making process affecting higher education and who represent the different governmental units, agencies, and institutions involved. The four panel members are Congressman John Brademas, Democratic Representative from Indiana, member of the House Education and Labor Committee; Governor Robert E. McNair of South Carolina; Dr. James A. Turman, Associate Commissioner of Education for Field Services, U. S. Office of Education; and Representative Mac Barber, Gerogia House of Representatives. Your moderator is from an institution of higher education and will try to articulate the institutional viewpoint.

As moderator my duty is to paint in the broad background of our subject for discussion and to raise questions to which either the panelists or members of the audience may wish to respond or react.

State organization of higher education does not have a common pattern. Among the fifty states there are numerous forms of organization. In most states we have not yet evolved an organization of higher education with which all parties are satisfied. We have not yet resolved the appropriate roles of the institutions, the coordinating agency, and the political organization of the state. We have not yet been successful in making an acceptable distinction between matters of "educational policy," which reasonably are the business of the educational organization, and matters of "public or political policy," which appropriately are reserved to state government.

In such a situation, federal activities in higher education certainly have an influence and impact on the state organization of higher education. Federal aid to higher education can be broadly categorized in three basic forms: aid to individuals--students and faculty--usually administered through the institution; aid given directly to the institution, usually in the form of categorical or programatic assistance; and the most recent innovation, aid given through state agencies under state plans.

Among a great many questions which can be asked in an attempt to evaluate the nature and extent of the impact of federal programs on state organization of higher education are the following: What is the basic federal purpose or objective to be served by each federal program? Is such purpose an appropriate responsibility of the federal government? What channel of administration and distribution best serves the sometimes conflicting interests of the federal government, the state government, the educational institutions, and the basic academic concerns related to the educational product--the student, and the essential educational instrument--the faculty?

In examining these questions we must distinguish between the programs which use higher education to accomplish a federal objective and aid programs designed to raise the level of competence in certain areas of research and education in the national interest. The federal objective may be the controlling factor in determining the appropriate method and manner of administration and distribution of the federal investment or contribution.

From the viewpoint of the state, which has the basic obligation for the major sector of the academic establishment, what effect do federal payments to, or through, individual institutions have on the state's continuing fiscal commitments and basic control? What voice does, or should, the state have regarding federal programs which require increasing state matching funds initiated between federal agencies and the institutions?

In regard to the new federal programs administered through the state, has this new state responsibility been a factor influencing the establishment of coordinating agencies in states without a formal coordinating organization? In states whose coordinating agencies are primarily data gathering and planning agencies, has responsibility for administering these federal programs tended to change the nature of these agencies? Because this new state responsibility includes the private sector of higher education, to what extent have states with over-all governing boards or coordinating agencies deemed it necessary to establish new state agencies to administer these federal programs? And where such new agencies have been established what has been the impact on the existing governing or coordinating agencies? Has the existing state organization for planning and coordinating higher education been weakened to any appreciable extent? In those states which have given the responsibility for administering these federal programs to the state coordinating body, has this resulted in additional personnel for the agency, increased its stability or stature, or provided a means for gaining closer involvement of private institutions in state planning?

From the viewpoint of the institutions, have the state-administered federal programs advantaged or disadvantaged institutional interests and operations? For the state institutions, has the undergraduate facilities program meant increased capital funding or has the tendency been to reduce state funding by the amount of anticipated federal grants? For all institutions, has the involvement of state-level agencies in the administration of federal programs merely added another administrative layer for clearance and approvals or does the evolvement of a state agency mean greater support for essential programs, properly planned and coordinated but without undue interference in internal administration? For the private institutions, does involvement with state administrative agencies tend to bring them into the sphere of influence of state government to such an extent as to cause reasonable concern for their ability to maintain independence and autonomy?

When we look to the future of federal assistance to higher education, other questions arise. Should more federal programs be administered through the states? What federal programs should not be administered by the states but should definitely be left to negotiation and implementation between the federal agencies and the institution? Is a federal program of general institutional support grants desirable? If so, should the program be implemented directly with the institutions, or should it provide state allotments to be administered under state plans by state agencies?

Some of these problems, and others, will be discussed by the panel. We hope that many of you will wish to respond to give us the benefit of your opinions and evaluations.

(Following are excerpts from the comments made by the members of the panel.)

Congressman John Brademas, Representative from Indiana

The opening remarks of Congressman Brademas dealt with the rapid rise in college enrollment and its influence on increased federal support of higher education.

He added that state and local public funds, coupled with private resources, have not been sufficient to provide the money necessary; as a result, a large number of students are in college today through a federal loan, scholarship or fellowship.

He went on to point out the necessity of maintaining a mixture of financial support from private, state, local and federal resources in order to perpetuate the diverse pattern which is the genius of American higher education.

A better job of planning at the state level is required, according to Congressman Brademas, to make the most effective use of the education dollar. He suggested the need for more cooperative programs, to help relieve some duplication of services and programs, and perhaps closer cooperation between public and private colleges and universities.

Congressman Brademas called for state agencies to do more to stimulate cooperation between higher education and the elementary and secondary schools, especially in such areas as teacher education--where it could work to mutual advantage.

The Congressman concluded, "I look for the decade ahead to bring a new era of cooperation in American education between public and private institutions and among federal, state and local education authorities."

Dr. James A. Turman, Associate Commissioner for Field Services, U. S. Office of Education

Dr. Turman first discussed the perplexities of administering federal aid to education with programs spread throughout the government and with no single federal agency to supervise the entire enterprise. He stated that further complications arise because conditions change with each new legislative year and at times programs authorized are not funded. Further problems he enumerated and discussed grow out of the need to avoid any semblance of federal control of education, the need to remain clear on the issue of the separation of church and state, and the mixed feelings of the states about the desirability of federal assistance.

Dr. Turman reviewed some of the changes taking place in the government's procedures for administering aid to education. "Until recently most of the aid to . . . higher education has been made directly to institutions . . . however, Congress is coming to rely more heavily on state level agencies to administer federal funds. There is, I feel, merit in both types of arrangements."

Aid channelled through state level agencies helps encourage a partnership between the state and the federal government and "should encourage the interchange of ideas between people in educational institutions and state agencies and . . . people in the federal government ultimately responsible for government aid." Under this procedure there can be "more coordination between federal programs and state plans and . . . better adjustment of state budgets to meet specific federal matching requirements."

Some of the disadvantages of aid through state agencies that he identified include: 1) the way state agencies vary from state to state as to function and effectiveness, 2) some state level agencies may not be able to handle aid to private institutions, 3) private institutions often fear state intrusion into their academic and financial affairs, 4) regional problems may be ignored, and 5) there may be conflict when state and federal objectives differ.

Governor Robert McNair, South Carolina

Governor McNair expressed the feeling that there are fewer differences between the states' and the federal government's views on assistance to higher education than on aid to elementary and secondary education. Consequently, relations are better and more is accomplished for higher education.

The Governor commented on the procedure used in South Carolina as an illustration of some of the implications for state government that resulted from federal activity in higher education. Since several of the federal assistance programs require special handling of funds at the state level, South Carolina had to create one new agency for a specific program. Because of the interrelationships of state level agencies and the necessity to coordinate efforts and plan together, agencies not concerned with higher education are required to offer assistance.

Governor McNair pointed out that a state should consider the availability of federal funds when making long-range plans, adding that it would help state planning if information about available federal money was more accessible.

The Governor closed by emphasizing the need for federal aid to education and noting that this aid must be considered as one resource in overall planning. In conclusion he said, "The job is a big one--too big for any one of us--but with common respect and faith in all involved, the problems can be resolved."

Representative Mac Barber, Georgia House of Representatives

As the state legislative spokesman for the panel, Representative Barber viewed federal assistance to higher education in terms of its support of people. He chose the extensive programs in science at the graduate level to illustrate the impact of federal assistance on the development of scientific manpower.

The state has not assumed its responsibility in these fields at the graduate level on two major counts, according to Representative Barber. The two areas he discussed as being covered by federal programs include stipends to support students and cost of education allowances for the institutions. In the training of graduate students in science, he pointed out that the federal government picks up the greater portion of the total support for the programs involved.

Representative Barber also discussed the need for coordination of federal programs within institutions to eliminate problems caused by too many grants that commit the institution, and therefore the state, to unexpected sums of money to cover additional, often hidden, costs of operation. Since many of the federal programs are designed to stimulate activity in areas identified as national needs, assistance is often in the form of "seed corn funds." Institutions using these funds know that at some time they will have to turn to the state for support of programs started or expanded in this way.

Focussing more specifically on research, Representative Barber pointed out the need to provide more assistance for training research personnel. Continual support for research must be coordinated with that for training qualified personnel if proper results are to accrue, he added. He then briefly reviewed the growing costs of educating Ph.D's and pointed out the need for continuing federal assistance at this level.

In closing, Representative Barber suggested that the government continue its system of grants to individual research professors who work with graduate students, institute departmental grants that would provide some equipment and support more personnel, and review more carefully the actual costs of graduate education as grants are made that affect these programs.

ROSTER

DELEGATES

ALABAMA

Senator Fred Folsom
Cullman

Representative Joe McCorquodale
Jackson

Representative Ralph Meade
Centre

Representative H. L. Pennington
Huntsville

Senator C. C. Torbert
Opelika

ARKANSAS

Representative O. P. Hammons
Forrest City

Representative Glen E. Kelley
Arkadelphia

Representative James L. Sheets
Siloam Springs

Senator Clifton Wade
Fayetteville

GEORGIA

Representative Mac Barber
Commerce

Senator Paul C. Broun
Athens

Senator J. Battle Hall
Rome

GEORGIA - Continued

Representative Chappelle Matthews
Athens

Representative Lamar Northcutt
College Park

Representative H. Walstein Parker
Sylvania

Senator Lamar R. Plunkett
Bowdon

KENTUCKY

Representative Sherman R. Arnett
Clearfield

Representative Ralph Bates
Frankfort

Representative James E. Bruce
Hopkinsville

Representative Mitchel B. Denham
Maysville

Representative John O. Hardin, III
Hopkinsville

Senator W. D. Huddleston
Elizabethtown

Representative Gether Irick
Stone

Representative Nell Guy McNamara
Mt. Sterling

LOUISIANA

Senator Frederick L. Eagan
New Orleans

Senator Olaf J. Fink
New Orleans

Senator Sylvan Friedman
Natchez

Representative Don Fortier
New Orleans

Representative John S. Garrett
Haynesville

Representative J. Thomas Jewell
New Roads

MARYLAND

Delegate J. Glenn Beall, Jr.
Frostburg

Delegate Edna P. Cook
Silver Spring

Senator Edward T. Hall
Prince Frederick

Senator Mary L. Nock
Salisbury

NORTH CAROLINA

Representative Ike Andrews
Siler City

Senator J. Ruffin Bailey
Raleigh

Representative Clarence Leatherman
Lincolnton

Senator Hector MacLean
Lumberton

OKLAHOMA

Representative Denton Howard
Oklahoma City

Senator Allen G. Nichols
Wewoka

Representative J. Thomas Taggart
Oklahoma City

Representative Allen Williamson
Cushing

SOUTH CAROLINA

Representative Harold D. Breazeale
Pickens

Representative Purvis W. Collins
Winnsboro

Senator Rembert Dennis
Moncks Corner

Senator W. Green DesChamps
Bishopville

Representative J. Brantley Harvey
Beaufort

Representative Nick A. Theodore
Greenville

TENNESSEE

Representative Dorothy Brown
Nashville

Senator Halbert Harvill
Clarksville

Senator Vernon Neal
Cookeville

Senator Stanley T. Snodgrass
Nashville

TEXAS

Representative Bill Barton
Borger

Representative Don W. Cavness
Austin

Representative David Crews
Conroe

Senator Jack Hightower
Vernon

Representative James Slider
Naples

VIRGINIA

Senator Lloyd C. Bird
Richmond

Delegate Frederick T. Gray
Richmond

Senator James D. Hagood
Clover

Senator Paul W. Manns
Bowling Green

Delegate Samuel E. Pope
Drewryville

Delegate D. French Slaughter
Culpepper

Delegate W. Roy Smith
Petersburg

Delegate J. Warren White, Jr.
Norfolk

WEST VIRGINIA

Delegate Kenneth Auvil
Bellington

WEST VIRGINIA - Continued

Delegate Ivor F. Boiarsky
Charleston

Senator John H. Bowling, Jr.
White Sulphur Springs

Senator Howard C. Carson
Fayetteville

Delegate Nick Fantasia
Kingmont

Senator Noah E. Floyd
Williamson

Senator Glenn D. Hatcher
War

Senator Walter A. Holden
Clarksburg

Senator E. Hans McCourt
Webster Springs

Delegate Evelyn Schupbach
New Martinsville

Speaker H. Laban White
Clarksburg

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

O. C. Aderhold
President Emeritus
University of Georgia

Robert C. Anderson
Vice President for Research
University of Georgia

OTHER PARTICIPANTS - Continued

Norton Beach, Dean
School of Education
University of North Carolina

Robert O. Berdahl, Director
Study of Statewide Systems of
Higher Education
American Council on Education

Howard R. Boozer, Director
North Carolina Board of Higher
Education

John Brademas, Congressman
Indiana

A. J. Brumbaugh
SREB Staff

Allan M. Cartter, Chancellor
New York University

B. Melvin Cole
Program Executive in Education
Maryland

Quill E. Cope, President
Middle Tennessee State University

James Corum, Intern
Southern Education Foundation

Lanier Cox, Director
Studies in Higher Education
University of Texas

J. Broward Culpepper, Chancellor
State University System of Florida

Wesley N. Dorn, Director
Advisory Council on Higher Education
Baltimore, Maryland

Glenn S. Dumke, Chancellor
The California State Colleges

Alan D. Ferguson
The Ford Foundation
New York, New York

Charles Foltz, Education Director
The Appalachian Regional Commission

William Friday, President
University of North Carolina

Ted. C. Gilbert, Executive Director
Kentucky Council of Public Higher
Education

James M. Godard
SREB Staff

Edwin C. Godbold
SREB Staff

Winfred L. Godwin
SREB Director

Dana B. Hamel, Director
Virginia Department of Community
Colleges

Byron S. Hollinshead
New Smyrna Beach, Florida

Thomas M. Keel
Legislative Budget Director
Austin, Texas

Brenda McLean
SREB Staff

Harold L. McPheeters
SREB Staff

Peter B. Mann
SREB Staff

Mary Ann Miller
SREB Staff

OTHER PARTICIPANTS - Continued

John D. Millett, Chancellor
Ohio Board of Regents

Robert E. McNair, Governor
State of South Carolina

Dan K. Moore, Governor
State of North Carolina

Henry Neal
Regents of the University System
of Georgia

Lionel H. Newsom
SREB Staff

William R. O'Connell, Jr.
SREB Staff

John W. Oswald, President
University of Kentucky

Ralph R. Perlman
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Wanda Peterson
SREB Staff

J. W. Rollow
SREB Staff

Maurice H. Saval
New England Board of Higher
Education

Katherine Savers, Education
Specialist
The Appalachian Regional Commission

E. F. Schietinger
SREB Staff

Hulett C. Smith, Governor
State of West Virginia

Ruth N. Smith
SREB Staff

Dorothy Snodgrass
SREB Staff

Robert L. Sumwalt, President Emeritus
University of South Carolina

Joyce C. Tallman
SREB Staff

James A. Turman
Associate Commissioner for Field Services
U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

William Webb
Kentucky

Prince B. Woodard, Director
Virginia State Council for Higher Education

APR 29 1969

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD
130 Sixth Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30313